

AFTER THE DELUGE: A POST-NATIONAL FUTURE FOR THE WHITE RACE

Ted Sallis

CREATIVE COMMONS LICENSE

© 2024. This work is openly licensed via [CC BY-NC-ND 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 DEED

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Canonical URL: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/legalcode.en>

NOTE: Sentences and paragraphs that are italicized are fair use quotations from the work of others, or major reproductions of some of my own past work, with either the name of the author given, or the source material information or link given, as a citation.

INTRODUCTION

The primary purpose of this book is to outline a strategy to pursue if the nationalist struggle fails and Whites, worldwide, become minorities in what used to be their nations, becoming essentially a post-national, stateless people. That unfortunate possibility is not the outcome we hope for, not what we fight for, and we should do all we can do to avoid it. It is, however, a very real possibility, becoming ever more likely with each passing year. It is therefore prudent, indeed imperative, to start planning today for this possibility. Any wise, forward-looking person must plan for contingencies, regardless of how distasteful those possibilities may be. I believe that some strategies used by Diaspora peoples, along with that of nationalist movements of the past (particularly the Romanian Legionaries), can be adapted for a possible post-national future for the White race.

A very important point is that the same approach that can work to preserve White interests “after the deluge” (the loss of White nations) can be used *today* to prevent the deluge from happening in the first place. Indeed, the approaches outlined here should be started today, as soon as possible. These powerful tools of collectivist and ethnocentric social engineering can help us win the battles that need to be fought to prevent the post-national future from ever taking place. Therefore, this book’s strategy represents two sides of a valuable coin – one side can be used today to aid in the fight to retake control of our destiny and attain the racial nationalist dream, and the other side can be used in the future in case that fight is lost, and we find ourselves as stateless minorities. Therefore, even those people who utterly reject the possibility of a post-national future for Whites, and absolutely insist on total victory and nothing else, should find this book useful. If they reject what they perceive as an unpleasant future, it is up to them to remake that future to their liking. The ideas discussed here can help them do so.

All men dream: but not equally. Those who dream by night in the dusty recesses of their minds wake in the day to find that it was vanity: but the dreamers of the day are dangerous men, for they may act their dreams with open eyes, to make it possible. - T. E. Lawrence, *Seven Pillars of Wisdom*

We must be “dreamers of the day” to make possible the future we desire. Optimally, that means retaining control over our nations, making our nations racially homogeneous, and creating societies of our people, by our people, and for our people. But if that dream does not come to be, we must then try to actualize another dream – to save our race and civilization if we find ourselves in a post-national, essentially stateless, functionally Diaspora people-like, situation.

The terms “ethny” (singular) and “ethnies” (plural) are used in this book, taken from Salter’s work on ethnic genetic interests. An ethny is a population group with genetic, ancestral ties – it can be a race, an ethnic group, a sub-division of an ethnic group, etc. Whites/Europeans are an ethny. British, Germans, and Italians are ethnies. English, Scottish, Prussians, Bavarians, Sicilians, etc. are ethnies. The scale may differ, but the concept is the same.

THE PROBLEM

What is the problem? What is this book about? I would first like to reproduce something from one of my *Western Destiny* blog posts, which was written in 2015, and can be found here:

<https://westdest.blogspot.com/2015/09/after-deluge-post-national-future-for.html>

Before we get to that 2015 post itself, I will first comment about it. This post introduces the problem and briefly outlines the fundamental approach that is being proposed. Please note that when I refer to a Diaspora-style future for Whites I am aware that this includes nations that are the ethnic homelands of White people (i.e., Europe) and that Europeans are the natives there. Nevertheless, being dispossessed of their nations, becoming minorities, and effectively stateless, they could then be viewed as being *functionally* a Diaspora-type people. The USA, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, etc. are also in the same boat. *The Camp of the Saints* is stark reality.

The 2015 essay: Assume the White Man has lost. What next?

Introduction: Hard times are upon us. The type of invasion of Europe predicted in The Camp of the Saints is occurring today, not in some distant future, and the pathologically altruistic response of weak, deracinated Europeans is exactly as outlined in that novel. In Germany, the monstrous harridan Merkel is behaving as an inverted anti-Hitler, presiding over the genocide of her own people. In the UK, the sight of one dead Syrian child invokes an outpouring of compassionate action that hundreds of sexually molested English children in Rotherham failed to elicit. The navies of Italy and Greece are dedicated to saving the invaders instead of repelling them, to facilitating the invasion instead of stopping it. Mainstreaming nationalist Orban of Hungary makes bombastic statements, while migrants riot in the streets of Budapest, and as invaders make a mockery of his pathetically porous cheap chicken wire “razor fence.” In France, mainstreaming heroine Marine Le Pen is more concerned with denouncing her own father than in standing as a new Joan of Arc against the invading hordes. Everywhere in Europe are the sights and sounds of surrender, of a people so fecklessly reckless (or is it recklessly feckless?) that they sacrifice their patrimony without the slightest hint of resistance whatsoever. In America, the System has long ago given up any pretense of guarding the border, and floods of illegal aliens join the unending stream of “legal” immigrants. And the only leading Presidential candidate who says otherwise is an abrasive buffoon whose main concern is showing he does not wear a toupee, and who wants a “big fat open door for legal immigrants.” Facts are facts: majority-White nation states are doomed if the present trends continue. What could come next? What should come next? What is the post-national future for a stateless White race that will not have any majority-White nations to call their own? What to do? How to survive? Is there a contingency plan?

There are those who will not be happy with a discussion of such a scenario. The “hard-core” “SuperHitler1488” types, sitting in front of their computers, with a toothbrush moustache crudely hand drawn on their upper lips with black marker, will rail against this “defeatism” and will proudly proclaim their “willingness to fight” (after they watch the latest movie or football game); the concern trolls will tell us all we need to do is follow Amren-style mainstreaming for another quarter-century and all will be

well; the “hate the messenger” sweaty obsessives will object to the message primarily because I am the one delivering it.

Nevertheless, this must be discussed. Contingency plans need to exist. A race considered “superior” by some, with much commentary about “future time orientation” and “planning and discipline” – you would expect the nationalist leadership of such a race to be very seriously considering alternative future scenarios and how to strategically prepare for, and deal with, each. Perhaps such planning is occurring, somewhere hidden from the view of “small-fry” such as myself, who dares not intrude upon the majestic thoughts of the mighty titans striding across the racial nationalist landscape of today. If such planning is indeed taking place, I applaud the initiative and wish it all the best. The problem is that I really do not believe anything of the sort is taking place. The inept “quota queens” of the “movement” are, I’m sure, mired in their foolishness and fantasies, which is why, in fact, we are in the trouble that we face today. Decades of complete uselessness do indeed incur a price on the inability of Whites to deal with the racial crisis.

Discussion: Therefore, imagine a scenario in which the USA is majority non-White, many of the major nations of Western Europe are majority non-White, other European nations are rapidly headed for similar status, Whites are a subaltern minority in what used to be their nations and homelands, a minority ruled by sneering aliens and step-and-fetchit White traitors. The grand dream of a White resistance to “turn the tide before it is too late” has failed to come to pass. The mainstreaming nationalists have failed to cash in on their groveling slithering toward the political center. The game is up and the White Man has lost. What then?

This is hard to answer without knowing the details of the situation. Are Whites still a plurality if not a majority? Are all the non-White populations allied against the Whites? Do law and custom still allow some degree of White resistance? Are there any majority-White nations still in existence and what is their level of power and their commitment to a racial resistance? These questions, and many others, need to be considered as possibilities. And, given how pathetically masochistic and delusional Whites are, we need to ask if, even at that late date, with the failures of multiculturalism on display for all to see, is there yet a significant fraction of Whites who “buy into” racial nationalism and finally realize the folly of pathological altruism?

Some may invoke the ethnocentric model of cohesive Jewish Diaspora group evolutionary strategies, as outlined in Kevin MacDonald’s works, as one possible model to follow for Whites who find themselves effectively equivalent to a stateless, diaspora people. There is much to say in favor of this, to an extent, although I note that the large amount of admixture which occurred with Jews at the beginning of their diaspora would be unacceptable for European preservationism, although the later stress on endogamy of course is exemplary.

At the risk of sounding like a broken record, I will suggest an approach based at least in part on Codreanu’s Legionary movement. One could envision a Pan-European, trans-national movement, highly elite, comradely and collectivist in orientation, with an emphasis on productive action, creating a higher form of man, with a defined style of living. In a sense, this legion would be analogous to some of the trans-national and Pan-European crusading orders of the past as well as recreating the best aspects of Codreanu’s movement, adjusted for modern times (e.g., Pan-European, rejecting universalist ethos, etc.). All of the differences between Codreanu’s movement and the failed racial nationalist “movement” of today (particularly the American variant) that I discussed in my book review (linked to above) would be relevant here: all the best of Codreanu’s movement would be embraced and all the flotsam and jetsam of contemporary racial and ethnic nationalism would be absolutely eschewed. Such a movement would provide the elite leadership to the stateless masses of the world-wide White

minority, guiding Whites through the dangers inherent in their status as a people without any nation states of their own. Such a movement would help to bind Whites worldwide in a brotherhood of solidarity – while of course absolutely rejecting White traitors – and will draw a hard line against any miscegenation between ethnic Europeans and those newcomers who have invaded White lands. With this Legion at the head, Whites – or at least racially conscious Whites – would be bound to each other through ties of race and culture and of a shared history, as well as of shared problems and the shared sacrifices necessary for survival. While respecting and preserving the distinctiveness that exists between different European groups, and honoring the histories of the lost nations of Europe, this Legion and the masses it leads will absolutely reject the intra-European divisiveness that led the race and civilization to their sorry state (and the sorry state we are in right now, already, even before the final defeat). Faced with existential threats to race and civilization, promotion of retrograde blood feuds among Europeans would be considered treason or madness, and treated as such (I would argue this should be applied today as well, and if it was, perhaps the scenario discussed here would not have to occur at all). Just as Codreanu's movement aimed at creating a new type of Romanian, the movement described here would aim at creation of a new type of European, a change in mind, a change in attitude, a change of spirit. In the fires of defeat, a new type of White Man will be forged to deal with the dangers of new realities, realities created by behavior that would be, finally, recognized as defective and rejected. No more pathological altruism, no more surrender, no more universalist ethos, no more groveling to the world of color while fighting fellow Whites – no more stupidity and no more error. It will take a special kind of elite to do these things, and that is what is proposed here.

Now, of course, I believe we should be doing off of this this now, to prevent the fate of dispossession from occurring in the first place. Indeed, I believe we should do this even in the event of a total White racial victory, not only to prevent the racial crisis from ever happening again, but also simply because it is the right thing to do, especially after World Wars I and II. In the end, this was the over-riding objective of the currently defunct Legion Europa project – a project which, in the last analysis, ran afoul of the “movement's” affirmative action program. Thanks, “movement.”

An aside: I must say this to those who champion petty nationalism, who believe that narrow ethnic nationalism is the key to survival: now is as good as time as any to see your thesis demonstrated. Various European ethnies still have control of their nation states, they are still the majority, and in certain European nations, ethnic nationalist political parties exist. I suggest, I urge, I implore for these ethnic nationalists to use the power of narrow ethnic appeal to stop the invasion of Europe. While that would not prove that ethnic nationalism is the way of the future, and would not prove it superior to racial nationalism, it would at least prove that ethnic nationalism has some utility, that is has sufficient power to at least temporarily arrest the demographic eclipse, the outright invasion, of the relevant narrow ethnies such nationalisms are concerned with. The time to do that is now. If you cannot even do that, if narrow petty nationalism cannot even motivate an ethny in the midst of an existential crisis, then what good does it have at all?

Summary: If and when Europeans become effectively stateless, when they lose control of all the institutions they have built, then the only thing they will be able to depend upon will be each other. The only thing that will ensure survival is each other. The only thing that can hold out the promise of taking back, or creating, nation states for themselves, is each other. It would be optimal to learn that lesson now, before the final Fall of the West, but if the only way to learn is through the bitter experience of total dispossession, so be it. If World Wars I and II were not sufficient lessons, and apparently, they were not, more painful and humiliating lessons are just around the corner.

Conclusion: This essay is in no way meant as any sort of comprehensive analysis of this question; it is instead merely meant to “wake up” relevant individuals and groups to the necessity to ask the question

*and come up with some answers. However, in the process of doing so, I outline, in very broad terms, one possible approach – the Legionary elite leadership approach - to consider as a possibility in dealing with a post-national White future. **End of Western Destiny essay.***

I am thinking that this may be the most realistic way forward, particularly since it is still compatible with the more traditional “save the nation, build the ethnostate” approaches. I am in fact rather pessimistic about those traditional approaches and objectives, and we had better start thinking outside the box now, instead of procrastinating. Consider how bad things have gotten since I wrote that post back in 2015. America saw the wasted Trump Presidency, the implosion of the Alt Right, the summer of Floyd and the subsequent hyper-woke madness and continued demographic decline with a wide-open southern border. The migrant crisis in Europe has only accelerated, the EU now imposes migrant quotas by diktat, even countries like Ireland are being buried under mass migration, the British Isles became a colony of South Asia with South Asian political leadership for a time, speech laws are becoming more and more intrusive including in the digital realm, a “Far Right” government in Italy not only refuses to stop illegal immigration but also wants to massively increased “legal” immigration, and the “great Hungarian hope” Orban is also letting in legal immigrants. Meanwhile, the horrendous Russia-Ukraine war is killing Slavs, who will no doubt be replaced by alien migrants.

Therefore, the future written about in the 2015 post is coming to pass. The failure of the Right to stop migration – a failure due to a lack of will and a lack of desire, not due to any methodological difficulty – is leading to a mainstream consensus view that the influx is inevitable and unstoppable.

A “Far Right” leader (Meloni) is elected in Italy, primarily to stem migration. What we have seen, at the time of my writing of this book is this:

<https://rmx.news/italy/melonis-betrayal-hungarian-media-calls-out-italian-leaders-u-turn-on-migration/>

However, during Meloni’s time in office, her migration policy took a sharply different direction, resulting in a surge in illegal arrivals, a topic covered extensively on this site.

Perhaps most notably, since taking power, Meloni has introduced legislation that is expected to allow 1.5 million new migrants to enter Italy through legal channels...Meloni’s legal migration regulation estimates that Italy will need 833,000 new migrants over the next three years to fill labor shortages. Matteo Villa, a migration expert at the Institute for International Political Studies (ISPI), a think tank in Italy, says this will be more than enough. He says that given Italy’s family reunification rules, which allow residents to bring relatives into the country, “it is easy to predict that in about 10 years these numbers will triple,” with at least 1.5 million migrants arriving...However, it must also be noted that Meloni is likely well aware that she has struck upon a strong political formula that may ensure her government remains in power longer than some previously believed.

Her Brothers of Italy party (Fdi) remains strong in the polls, hovering at 29 percent, and her party remains the most popular in Italy. In fact, Meloni is more popular now than when she was first voted into office despite embracing a very liberal immigration policy. How is this possible?

She has in many ways mastered the art of issuing anti-woke platitudes to the Italian masses while promoting mass immigration at the same time...

Thus, the same voters who voted for Meloni to stop the influx have been politically rewarding her for increasing it.

See this:

<https://rmx.news/hungary/not-a-single-european-country-has-self-sustaining-birth-rates-warns-hungarian-president-as-demographic-crisis-grows/>

The demographic crisis is perhaps the biggest threat Europe is currently facing, warned Hungarian President Katalin Novák in an hour-long interview with news station InfoRádió, just ahead of the 5th Budapest Demographic Forum.

“Not having enough children is not only a Hungarian phenomenon, it is the same everywhere in the so-called developed Western world. If we just think about the fact that there is not a single country in Europe today that has enough children to even maintain its population — so we are not talking about population growth — then we can sense how big the problem is,” Novák said.

But the Hungarians are letting in “legal immigrants” as well. Many European nations are headed toward minority-White status, and that is in the ancestral homelands of the White race.

The wages of non-White immigration into Sweden:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2023/sep/13/sweden-gang-violence-shootings-explosions>

Gang wars have brought an “unprecedented” wave of violence to Sweden, the national police chief has said, after a week of fatal shootings.

Sweden has for several years been in the grip of a conflict between gangs fighting over arms and drug trafficking, involving firearms and explosive devices.

In “right-wing” Poland, we see:

<https://abcnews.go.com/International/wireStory/cash-visas-scandal-hits-polands-strongly-anti-migration-103191137>

Poland's President Andrzej Duda said Thursday he was awaiting the results of an investigation into allegations that Polish consulates sold temporary work visas to migrants for thousands of dollars, just weeks before the strongly anti-migration ruling party seeks re-election for a third term.

Media reports allege Poland's consular sections issued some 250,000 visas to migrants from Asia and Africa since 2021 in return for bribes.

The UK and France have become increasingly Colored dystopias, where freedom for natives diminishes along with their demographic representation. The British Isles have South Asian political leadership at the time that I am writing this in late 2023. Also at this time, I note that several months ago France was rocked by mass race riots that were one small step away from civil war. In many areas in those nations, one of the most popular, if not the most popular, male baby name is Mohammad.

Germany is ground zero for ethnomasochism, with the original Turkish minority being reinforced with wave after wave of Afro-Asiatic migrants, enthusiastically supported by the establishment.

And throughout Europe, speech-restricting laws prevent natives from speaking out in defense of their interests, natives are jailed for expressing anti-diversity views, and the EU not only prevents its constituent nations from guarding their borders but mandates migrant quotas and punishes those that do not comply.

In America, White demographics are collapsing, the southern border is completely open, mass immigration – both legal and illegal – continues unabated from non-White sources, and the sociopolitical milieu is openly and aggressively anti-White, with virtually the entire System siding with non-Whites against White interests. A typical news story:

<https://www.foxnews.com/politics/migrant-numbers-overwhelming-arizona-border-facilities-amid-new-wave-street-releases-begin>

An Arizona Border Patrol sector is facing overwhelming numbers, with new images showing the overcrowding in facilities, as agents have been green-lit to release migrants on the streets to cope with the pressure.

Photos in Ajo, Arizona, taken by retired ICE Field Office Director John Fabbriatore, show illegal migrants being detained in an outdoor holding facility in the Tucson sector.

The sector has seen 2,000 illegal crossings a day for three days, and agents have resorted to street releases in order to decompress the packed shelters. The population includes migrants from Africa, including many from Senegal.

American cities, already destroyed for White existence by racial diversity, are being completely obliterated by the migrant influx, all aided and abetted by the System. The political consequences of a soon-to-be-White-minority America means that there is no realistic way of voting the nation out of this disaster.

Demography is destiny. Whites are headed toward minority status in the USA and Western Europe; no doubt, other White nations will eventually follow that path, assuming nothing changes. If things are bad now, imagine how they will be for Whites when they are minorities, effectively losing control over their nations and their national destinies. The problem is real, all too real. Therefore, looking at the overall White World, the global situation is that of a racial and civilizational crisis. The 2015 essay is more relevant than ever, and its recommendations need to be carefully considered.

To summarize the three main pillars of the approach proposed by this work:

1. A worldview that is ethnocentric, strictly endogamous, collectivist, with a strong sense of international solidarity for all persons of European descent – a worldwide Brotherhood of Europeans. This would be strongly, radically, authentically Pan-European; thus, while intra-European differences will be respected and the uniqueness of all ethnic groups safeguarded, the absolute solidarity of all Europeans, without narrower divisions, must be an absolute necessity.

In the dark, multiracial future in which this strategy would be actualized, the dividing line between Europeans and non-Europeans will be stark and existential; in this scenario, every fellow European, every fellow White, is a person of value, and all the old negative divisions must be absolutely eschewed. Of course, this does not require panmixia; people can still prefer to personally associate with and mate with whoever they choose within the European family, but with respect to overall interactions, identity, assistance, and feelings of kinship, all Europeans worldwide, of every European ethnic group or combination of such groups, are part of the same extended racial and civilizational family and must be treated as such.

2. Organizations and various socioeconomic as well as cultural structures, of an international nature, should be created to promote the interests of persons of European descent, wherever they may be. These organizations must be rigidly ethnocentric in racial terms (for persons of European descent only),

collectivist, cooperative, and highly effective. Included in this approach is assistance with political, social, economic, demographic, genetic, cultural, medical, scientific-technical, and defensive matters. As regards the latter, there must be mechanisms in place to safeguard the physical security of our people.

3. There must be an overarching elite, a Legion of Europeans, of high moral character and effectiveness, spearheaded by The New Man, to coordinate the continued existence of and promotion of our people. One can envision a worldwide Pan-European, modern version of the Romanian Legionary movement.

The details of all of this will be explored in the remainder of this work. An important point, which will be stressed later, is that this approach is not only relevant for the post-national scenario, but can be instituted right now, today, to aid in the fight to save our nations and to prevent the post-national outcome from ever occurring. The power of this approach is its flexibility for meeting the needs of our people in a variety of different racial scenarios.

The After the Deluge Contingency: Post-National Future

What are the strategies that we need to follow if we do indeed find ourselves in a post-national future? We can begin by discussing who exactly is a member of our ingroup; in other words, who belongs to our tribe? Who are our people? Once we know *who* it is whose interests we will need to promote in a post-national future, we can then consider different facets of the approaches that will be required to achieve this. We can begin by considering what should be the fundamental underlying ideology of pro-White activities.

The Fundamentals

See this post:

<https://westdest.blogspot.com/2012/12/the-fundamentals.html>

I previously wrote of what I consider the “Fundamentals of a New Movement” to replace the current failed pro-White “movement.” While the following was written to describe a movement aimed at retaking control of our nations, the same fundamental principles can form the ideological basis of a movement to promote the interests of Whites in a post-national future. Thus, these fundamental principles hold regardless of whether we save our nations and use the approach outlined in this book to achieve that, whether we find ourselves in a post-national future, or a combination scenario of one or more ethnostates combined with large stateless European “Diaspora” populations found elsewhere. These principles are considered fundamental precisely because of their universal application for our people. These principles are:

Pan-Europeanism as the major focus will replace other more narrow “isms” – be they national, ethnic, subracial, etc. The narrower “isms” will not disappear; they can continue to exist, but at a lower level than the overarching Pan-European unity. The two fratricidal world wars of the 20th century wrecked Europe, the West, and the White race, and those who continue to promote division even now, are, whether they know it or not, working for the enemy, working for the Death of Europe and for the destruction of the worldwide fraternity of the European Peoples. Therefore, all those who preach division within the European family – be that division genetic, phenotype, cultural, historical, religious – are the enemies of European Man and enemies of the West and enemies of our Identity and our Future.

Genetic kinship will replace racial “purity.” As per Salter, ultimate interests are genetic interests, and genetic interests are based upon genetic kinship. Only genetic kinship is relevant for biopolitics. This contrasts to the unscientific strawman of racial “purity” which is usually derived from some a priori comparison to a picked parental population. Since all genetic differences, regardless of their derivation (e.g., “admixture” [real or an artifact], selective pressures, genetic drift, etc.) influence genetic kinship, measurement of such kinship is the most inclusive and definitive approach for understanding our ultimate interests. We accept the European genepool for what it is now and strive to improve it in the future. To use Yockey’s terminology in a new way, we completely replace outdated and unscientific “vertical” concerns with “purity/admixture” with “horizontal” concerns with genetic kinship and genetic interests.

Total biocultural Identity will replace narrower biological and cultural identities as the major focus of European Being. The narrower identities will still exist, but as part of Identity, and the narrower identities will become increasingly aligned with that of Identity. Biological and cultural classifications by themselves are not disjunctive, only total Identity is disjunctive. The ultimate solution to any discordance between Identity and biological identities is this: we will align our biological/genetic interests with Identity by closing the borders and stopping non-European gene flow into European territories. Thus, over time the genetic boundaries between Europe and the Others will become ever larger and more distinct; the genetic commonalities between Europeans, compared to the Others, will become larger and more integrated. The same applies to any potential cultural overlaps between The West and The Rest. Examples of this possibility, as exemplified by the Levant and by China, are shown here.

Biopolitics will replace the old fraud of Right vs. Left. We care not if any specific policy of ours, or our entire program, is deemed “rightist” or “leftist” or whatever outdated label. We are not conservatives, reactionaries, not in any way beholden to “right-wing” thought. We are revolutionaries, striving to create a new order.

Futurism, not Traditionalism. Unlike some of the more reckless statements in support of Futurism, we do not call for the abolition of museums, the disregarding of our past and the great deeds of our ancestors. Past, Present, and Future are all linked. However, we look to the Future, our real Golden Age is that which we will make in the Future, it is not some sort of delusional Traditionalist fantasy set in the Past. We will not reject the deeds of our ancestors, but these are not the sum of our being, we do not settle for them – we must surpass them. We remember the Past, but for the purpose of spurring us to achieve greater deeds in the Future.

Rational realism and empiricism are for facts, values and objectives can be irrational. Thus, we reject the old, timeworn, factually incorrect knee-jerk beliefs, memes, and paradigms that have defined the so-called “racialist movement,” particularly in America. With respect to facts, history, knowledge – the age of “movement” dogma is over. We reject the misanthropic freakishness and lies of the old movement. With respect to facts, we depend on rationality, on realism, on empiricism – on real Science. But these things cannot provide us with our values and our objectives – they are merely tools. Our values and objectives can be irrational as they spring forth from our vision of the reality we want to come into being. But we cannot confuse what we want with what actually is – nor can we settle for what is instead of what we actually want. What is – that is the current reality, which must be discerned with empiricism. What we want is derived from our values, irrational as they may (or may not) be, and for these objectives, empiricism is only a tool, a means, not an end to itself. As part of this, the fantasies of Traditionalism – which invents false facts – must be put aside in favor of empirical facts and the irrational objectives of an enlightened Futurism.

Preservationism plus eugenics replaces static preservationism. *We are not interested in preserving a racial stasis, which is biologically impossible in any case. In contrast, we avoid genetically damaging mass changes, preserving the core of racial genetic essence. We wish to promote eugenics to improve the stock and, also, allow for the creation of new stabilized blends of European stocks – while also at the same type preserving the original stocks – to increase the diversity of European Man. Ethnic genetic interests are compatible with (gradual) genetic change within the race, eschewing miscegenation, particularly when that change can enhance fitness, and when it is in magnitude no greater than the genetic changes that have always been part of human existence; for example; those due to selective pressures or random genetic drift.*

We can now consider the questions of who and whom? What is our ingroup? Who are our people? For what group is this approach targeted to?

Fundamentals and Prerequisites for Membership

Pan-Europeanism

The approach outlined here, the worldwide Brotherhood of Europeans, must be absolutely, radically, and authentically Pan-European. Consider this post:

<https://eginotes.wordpress.com/2023/06/27/wdr3-Pan-Europeanism/>

What is Pan-Europeanism?

Pan-Europeanism is an ideology which respects, strives to preserve, and fights for the interests of **all** peoples of European descent worldwide—whether these peoples are of single ethnic origin or if they are of “combinative” ethnic European ancestry. There is nothing in this definition which asserts that panmixia must take place and certainly nothing which can be characterized as a lack of interest in preserving various specific European ethnic groups.

Many activists and groups claim to be Pan-European or Pan-Aryan, but truly are not. Indeed, the only truly Pan-European (by my standards) individuals and groups that I am aware of, who have any significant standing in the Dissident Right/Far Right, would be Norman Lowell and his Imperium Europa and myself, along with my Sallis Groupuscule. Those who claim to be Pan-European or Pan-Aryan often are not. Their definition of “Europe” seems to end with any territory to the south of Vienna or east of Berlin. Put these people under a bit of pressure and their animus toward certain European ethnic groups comes spewing out.

Some may point the finger at me and cite my own harsh criticism of various European groups. Putting aside that a fraction of my criticism is tongue-in-cheek, I note that I make criticism when such is warranted and that **all** groups are subject to my critique. I do not play favorites, protecting certain groups from criticism while targeting others with unfair and intense vitriol. My criticism essentially takes the form of “tough love” in which the legitimate faults of groups are (sometimes harshly) pointed out in the hope that these groups will accept the criticism, recognize its legitimacy, and take steps, if possible, to rectify the situation. This can be contrasted with, for example, Nordicists, who heap targeted, and frequently unfair, critical abuse toward Southern (especially) and Eastern Europeans, while the only criticism they have of Northern Europeans are expressed in terms of implicit praise – Northern Europeans are just too noble, too altruistic, too honorable, too disinterested, too individualistic, and just too good in every way. Hopefully, my point is made. Pan-Europeanism does not mean any or all European groups are immune from criticism. It *does* mean that one does not play favorites, and applies

criticism, or praise, fairly and legitimately when such is warranted, and does so with the understanding that the group criticized is part of “us” and that the criticism is to make “us” better.

One practical reason to embrace Pan-Europeanism is that there is no single European nation or ethny that is currently any good from the objective standpoint of adaptive fitness, that is doing well, that is resisting the System, which is stopping the migrants, that has replacement birthrates, and that is not a humiliating disappointment. Your favorite ethny, or narrow grouping of ethnies, is going to disappoint you. You will not find the critical mass of quality activists restricting the search in that manner. You will have to take the best from each European ethny, and set aside your petty grievances and prejudices, and form an ingroup of these best and brightest based on the same criterion of “biological whiteness” that the petty nationalists denounce.

Gone— forever gone— is any notion that one of these Ideas— national, linguistic, religious, social— has the mission of wiping out another Idea. The adherents of Empire are still distinct from the adherents of Papacy— but this distinction does not rule their minds, for uppermost now is the Idea of Imperium, the return to superpersonal origins, and both of these mighty Ideas have the same spiritual source. The difference between Protestant and Catholic— once excited into a casus belli— has gone the same way. Both continue to exist, but it is inconceivable that this difference could again rend the Western Civilization in twain. There have been also the racial and temperamental differences of Teuton and Latin, of North and South. Once these may have contributed to the furnishing of motives to History— this can they no longer do. Again, both are part of the West, even though different, and the Imperium-Idea monopolizes the motivation of History. - Francis Parker Yockey, Imperium

We should listen to what Yockey had to say there. Regardless of the exact outcome, whether we save our nations or are forced into a post-national future, hostility between Europeans must cease.

O.R.I.O.N. = Our Race Is Our Nation

Brotherhood of Europeans

We must therefore have a sincere, genuine Brotherhood of Europeans. We must also adopt an “Ourselves Alone” attitude; looking for others to save us is a pipedream and it is inherently dangerous to depend on outgroup members, who have their own group interests, to assist in the survival of our ingroup. Temporary alliances of convenience with outgroups may be necessary from time to time, but the fundamental, permanent focus must only be on us.

Against Petty Nationalism

There are some who oppose the Pan-European perspective. Many nationalists in Europe embrace an “ethnonationalist” petty nationalism, often obsessing over historical grievances with their European neighbors. There are also those in America who promote petty nationalism and there are Nordicists and others who divide Europeans on a perceived racial basis, and there are religious schisms and other areas of discord. See the following post as an example of a riposte against a prominent American promoter of petty nationalist ethnonationalism:

<https://eginotes.wordpress.com/2023/01/21/against-greg-johnson/>

Keep in mind that when some ethnonationalists preach their doctrine, they really are promoting *ethnoimperialism*; indeed, some ethnonationalists live in nations that are not their own, nations to which they have no ethnic ties. In many cases there is a racial tie (I refer to those who live in White-majority nations; some in fact live in lands of Color), but then these types denounce “biological whiteness,” so

I'm not sure what their rationale is for basing their living arrangements on race and not on the narrow basis of ethnicity. It seems like it is "ethnonationalism for me but not for thee" – their homelands are sacrosanct and reserved only for their narrow ethnic group, but on the other hand they and their co-ethnics can live wherever they please. That sort of imperial attitude (usually associated with Nordicism, Anglomania, etc.) is hypocritical and corrosive of White unity.

As Whites worldwide are increasingly being submerged in what Lothrop Stoddard (himself a Nordacist) presciently called *The Rising Tide of Color*, we will, naturally, among those of us who have proper good sense, recognize in our fellow Europeans our racial and civilizational kin. We will, as we must, value all Europeans worldwide, regardless of their specific ethnic ancestry or ancestries. As Yockey wrote:

The touching of this racial-frontier case of the Negro however, shows to Europe a very important fact — that race-difference between white men, which means Western men, is vanishingly small in view of their common mission of actualizing a High Culture. In Europe, where hitherto the race difference between, say, Frenchman and Italian has been magnified to great dimensions, there has been no sufficient reminder of the race-differences outside the Western Civilization. Adequate instruction along this line would apparently have to take the form of occupation of all Europe, instead of only part of it, by Negroes from America and Africa, by Mongols and Turkestani from the Russian Empire. - Francis Parker Yockey, Imperium

We are getting to the point of such an occupation throughout the White World, and the "adequate instruction" will be forthcoming; indeed, it already is occurring. Certainly, of course, there is nothing wrong with a person having a greater preference for their own ethnic group; that is natural. But it should only be a matter of degree, not the absurd disjunctive "us vs. them" attitude petty nationalists have against their fellow Europeans. Feeling closer to a brother than to a cousin is fine, but you should feel close to all your kin, cousins included, and make a distinction between kin and those who are truly alien. The true "us vs. them" distinction is between Europeans and non-Europeans, between Whites and Color. When face-to-face with the **ALIEN**, all your racial brothers and cousins will be of incalculable value. We should adopt such an attitude today; if we do, perhaps the post-national future can be avoided.

And if we do save ourselves before we lose our nations, and we avoid the post-national future, we should still have the attitude of Pan-European racial unity and that of valuing all Europeans. After all, such a victory would by necessity have been achieved at an enormous cost, with a massive world-historical struggle, against great odds, and through a worldwide effort of all White ethnies. We should at that point remember all the problems and errors that brought us to the point that such a struggle was necessary, including the divisive petty nationalism and the two world wars of the 20th century that wrecked the White World. We need not be foolish again; we need not, we must not, make the same errors again. Even in victory, Whites would be a minority of the world's population; we need to value each other and stand together and stand apart from Color.

It is absolutely necessary to the continuance of the subjugation of Europe that the outsiders have large numbers— whole societies, groups, strata, remnants of dead 19th century nations— of domestic European populations available for their purposes. Against a united Europe, they could never have made their way in, and only against a divided Europe can they maintain themselves. Split! divide! distinguish!— this is the technique of conquest. Resurrect old ideas, old slogans, now quite dead, in the battle to turn European against European. But work always with the weak, Culture-less stratum against the strong bearers and appreciators of Culture. These must be "tried" and hanged.

This availability of the under-strata of the Culture to outside forces is one type, and the most dangerous, of that form of Culture-pathology called Culture-distortion. It is closely related however to another type called Culture-retardation. - Francis Parker Yockey, *Imperium*

Yockey was correct. Petty nationalism is Culture Retardation and it is a form of Race Treason.

Also see this:

<https://westdest.blogspot.com/2021/06/yockey-in-21st-century.html>

One more thing; I would like to quote from my 2015 *After the Deluge* essay that is reproduced above:

I must say this to those who champion petty nationalism, who believe that narrow ethnic nationalism is the key to survival: now is as good as time as any to see your thesis demonstrated. Various European ethnies still have control of their nation states, they are still the majority, and in certain European nations, ethnic nationalist political parties exist. I suggest, I urge, I implore for these ethnic nationalists to use the power of narrow ethnic appeal to stop the invasion of Europe. While that would not prove that ethnic nationalism is the way of the future, and would not prove it superior to racial nationalism, it would at least prove that ethnic nationalism has some utility, that is has sufficient power to at least temporarily arrest the demographic eclipse, the outright invasion, of the relevant narrow ethnies such nationalisms are concerned with. The time to do that is now. If you cannot even do that, if narrow petty nationalism cannot even motivate an ethny in the midst of an existential crisis, then what good does it have at all?

So, putting aside questions as to whether petty nationalism is race treason and whether it is a stable long-term strategy for White survival, basically we can state that if petty nationalism, if ethnonationalism, has any utility whatsoever, then it would be able to stop, at least temporarily, or at least slow down to a significant degree, the demographic destruction of the White World. If the ethnonationalists believe that their way is the correct way forward for Whites, then they need to show some success. *Where's the beef?* - to borrow that old commercial phrase. The American "movement" is dominated by ethnonationalist types. Certainly, the Far Right in Europe is completely dominated by ethnonationalists. They in fact dominate the entire Dissident Right. And yet we go from failure to failure, from defeat to defeat. Indeed, the reason why this *After the Deluge* work is necessary is related to the complete failure of the petty nationalists. Indeed, the ethnonationalists are very successful when it comes to generating hostility to other Whites, culminating in the two world wars that wrecked our racial and civilizational world; however, they are less successful when it comes to resisting the rising tide of color. Brexit is the model here; the British cut the influx of all those dastardly "Polish plumbers" while seeing continued and even increased immigration from the world of Color. One wonders if Racial Proximity Theory had anything to do with that. See this post:

<https://eginotes.wordpress.com/2020/06/08/racial-proximity-theory/>

Also see this for more criticism of narrow ethnonationalism:

<https://eginotes.wordpress.com/2022/12/28/against-ethnonationalism/>

Defining the Ingroup

What is the ingroup? What are the minimal requirements for belonging to the worldwide Brotherhood of Europeans? Yes, we can talk about people of European descent. But how is this defined?

I do **not** promote the idea of any sort of genetic testing for ingroup membership, except in cases where genealogical ancestry is unknown. Ingroup membership should instead be determined by genealogical

ancestry from one or more of Europe's indigenous ethnies, as I have defined the term indigenous (see below), coupled with civilizational markers of identity. The problem with genetic testing for the purpose of strict membership criteria, particularly at the individual level (groups are discussed below), is that the tests are too inaccurate and imprecise to provide data that can be matched against some strictly defined, arbitrarily determined "acceptable percentage." If you set a threshold at 95% (or some other arbitrary number) is there a meaningful statistically significant difference between 94.9% and 95%? If 94.9% is OK, then what about 94.8% and onward down? Who sets these arbitrary limits and what justifies them? Of course, one can argue that the only purely objective percentage for group membership is 100% (and, conversely, 0%). But the ancestry tests are unlikely ever to be accurate and precise to the level of **definitively** stating someone is 100% of anything. Statistical error exists, different tests perform ancestry modeling with varying reference samples, and results are often updated, so that a given result may not be stable over time. Someone who tests at 100% may be, say, really 98%, and someone who tests at 98% may be really 100%. Lowering the threshold to 98% results in the same problem. Who is really 98% and who is, say, 95%? True enough, if someone tests as, say, 25% sub-Saharan African, they are not European, but that's not the issue, practically speaking. The issue is usually one of very low percentages of "admixture" from highly distinct alien groups and/or higher percentages of "admixture" ancestry from relatively closely related alien groups that become poorly distinguished because of faulty modeling.

And that brings up another issue - even if the issue of statistical error is solved, then there is the problem of modeling. Output is only as good as input, and supervised admixture analysis (comparing the target individual to a pre-determined set of reference populations) depends on the parental populations used for modeling. One can do unsupervised admixture analysis (looking for patterns in the data and letting group designations emerge from the analysis), but then one needs to define the ancestral components that are so identified (see my discussion of groups below).

In supervised admixture analysis, which is typically used in ancestry testing, if there is a lack of the proper parental population samples, then the outcomes will not be representative, and will be inaccurate. Therefore, it is not surprising that different tests can give significantly different results for the same individual, or that a person's results can markedly change when a parental population database is updated. If an update can significantly change a person's results, then how is any of that an accurate and precise measure of genetic ancestry? How can such results be used for political purposes with strictly defined cut-offs? Obviously, it cannot. Further, if the parental population was very large – for example, large enough to guarantee accurate results – then the outcome of genetic testing would be for the most part essentially the same as genealogical ancestry, since the person being tested would be compared to a fair, comprehensive, and fully representative parental population modeling of the ancestry of that person. So, it all conflates to genealogical ancestry in the end.

In any case, even if all these technical problems with genetic testing are solved, it still brings up the question of arbitrary limits. If you say only 100% is acceptable – is someone 99.5% significantly different? The number of issues and problems become untenable. One would need to solve all these problems for the testing to have real value, and then you would still have the fundamental issue of determining and justifying (arbitrary) cut-offs and defining "European."

On the other hand, if genealogical data (that of course can be supplemented by genetic data as a secondary confirmation on a qualitative level without nitpicking to narrow percentage points) are available, one can say that, for example, someone is genealogically X% derived from group A and Y% derived from group B, and A and B can be considered at the group level as described below. Genealogical ancestry is therefore clearer cut. For example, someone with a non-European grandparent is clearly 25% non-European, a large and significant difference. We are not parsing 100%

vs. 98% in that case. 100% ancestry from a genealogical standpoint is not only more accurate and precise but provides numerically understandable variation linked to kinship and identity.

Again, I am not saying that individual genetic testing is useless, if properly done and properly interpreted. It can be an important secondary screen for people who already know their ethnic ancestry, can give information on kinship and kinship overlap, and other useful data. But that is secondary and not determinative. For people who are, say, adopted, and lack genealogical data, genetic testing can be used, but should be interpreted liberally. If such a person is accepted as White and has a predominantly European genotype, then fine. I know that is subjective and that some arbitrary standards will be required in those cases. But such cases are a very small percentage of the population. For most people, we know what their ethnic ancestry is.

Another point – the raw data from such tests can be used for kinship analysis, kinship overlap vs. distance, “child equivalents,” etc. That *does* have very important political – biopolitical – utility but cannot be used for any sort of strictly defined cut-off interpretation.

And at the *group* level, indigenous European groups are European by definition, so this can become circular reasoning if one attempts to define a European genotype based on the genotypes of groups defined as European. One could do unsupervised admixture analysis and/or principal components analysis and/or kinship assays, etc. and see where groups fall out, and we have that data. But at the end of the day, you must define what genetic data set is European and that comes back to needing a definition that does not require itself in a circular manner. We can define “European” in terms of “indigenous European” as follows.

Defining Indigenous

This post explains my definition of indigenous:

<https://westdest.blogspot.com/2013/01/indigenous-defined.html>

What is meant by "indigenous?"

I've attempted to define "indigenous" at other forums, and here I'd like to put together a brief, one sentence definition.

A human group is indigenous when it is the oldest existing population to come into being as a distinct ethny, different from any other, in a specific territory.

1. Existing - extinct groups may have been indigenous to a given territory at one time, but if they no longer exist, they are obviously not currently indigenous. The indigenous population of today's France is the French ethny, not the Neanderthals and Cro-Magnons who once lived there, and who were indigenous at those times.

2. Oldest - new groups can come into a territory and form ethnies, but if a prior indigenous population still exists in that territory, then it is that prior group that is indigenous, not any new ethnies formed by the newcomers. Only if the prior population becomes extinct, can the new group eventually evolve into a new indigenous group.

3. Distinct and different - if an already established ethny moves into an uninhabited territory or drives an existing indigenous group to extinction, the new group, as it is, is not indigenous to that territory, as they came there as an already formed group that is indigenous to their original homeland. This group

will have to undergo change in their new colony, becoming a different and distinct group from their forebears, in order to be classified as indigenous to the new territory. Indigenous correlates to the idea of ethnogenesis - transplanting an existing group with no further significant change is not ethnogenesis.

4. Specific territory - as explained in #3 above, a group cannot be indigenous to two different territories at the same time. The ethnogenesis of a distinct group has to take place in one area. Further, Diaspora groups, spread far and wide, are not indigenous to any specific territory, even if the original host populations become extinct and even if Diaspora ethnogenesis takes place. Only if the ethnogenesis creates distinct groups in each separate territory, in the absence of any original population, can indigenous hold as a definition.

Others may have their own definition, but this I believe suffices as a reasonable approximation of what people mean by "indigenous."

If we thus define European as the oldest extant groups in European territory who have undergone ethnogenesis there, then we can proceed to use the groups so defined to characterize the European genotype. But you cannot use a genotype to define a genotype; how do you determine that genotype to begin with without knowing what populations you need to consider? It is true that genetic clustering puts Europeans together in an objective fashion (***that, importantly, provides strong support for my definition of indigenous***), but a nitpicking argument can be made that the specific clustering boundaries may be, in some cases, somewhat subjective, particularly with closely related groups. Hence, there is a need for an independent definition of the groups being considered, so that the group genotype can be determined as a target against which to compare individuals. But individual assays have the additional problems of increased variation and error compared to mass data sets. In the end, a biological definition of the ingroup can, at the individual level, be most objectively characterized as genealogical ancestry from those population groups that are (indigenously) European.

Then there are other components of identity, such as culture, civilization, and group loyalty. On a religious basis, Christians, deists, pagans, atheists, and agnostics are compatible with a European/White/Western identity, but, say, Islam, Buddhism, Hinduism, etc. are not. Does the person identify with Europe and its history? Are they loyal to White interests, or at least neutral, and not traitors?

All these biological/ancestry and cultural/civilizational/personal components synergize to form an ingroup identity for us.

That ingroup is composed of **ALL** persons of European descent (if they also identify with our race and civilization and are not traitors). European descent is defined as genealogical descent from one or more of the indigenous ethnies of Europe, with "indigenous" clearly defined, as discussed above.

The following post explains my views on ingroup identity:

<http://westdest.blogspot.com/search/label/indigenous>

What are the basic components of the identity of our ingroup? At its most basic, we can define three fundamental components of ingroup identity: ancestry, culture, behavior.

Ancestry: Elsewhere here we discuss genetic kinship, a quantitative metric, but here we define the qualitative biological component of ingroup identity for us: ancestry as indigenous European. What is indigenous? We define it here.

Thus, for example, the English, French, Italians, Germans, and Spaniards are all indigenous Europeans, at the national level. At the regional level, we have, for example, Cornish, Bretons, Lombards and Sicilians, Prussians and Bavarians, and Catalans. In Scandinavia, the Germanic Scandinavians are indigenous to the southern regions, while the Saami are indigenous to the north. These are all indigenous Europeans.

What about Jews, Gypsies, and Turks? Turkey is Asian, not European. Jews and Gypsies, who entered an already-occupied Europe in historical times, are not indigenous to any specific territory in Europe. Is there a nation or region of Europe which is the homeland of Jews or Gypsies? No, there is not. They are Diaspora peoples, scattered throughout Europe. Even if one wanted to assert some sort of vague, generally European ethnogenesis for the Ashkenazim and Roma, that does not work, since every place in Europe where they are found there has always been an extant, older, "host" population of indigenous Europeans already present. Thus, intrusive elements into a land occupied by extant, original peoples cannot be indigenous to that land - whether the land is a continent, nation, or region.

This, of course, does not mean that individual Jews or Gypsies cannot be assimilated. Nor does it mean that small numbers of highly assimilable Jews or Gypsies or any other similar group could not be accepted. But, it certainly does mean that the entire Jewish or Gypsy ethnies are not European, not part of our ingroup, and cannot be accepted en masse into any Euro-centered project that we will focus on.

Culture: A person can be indigenous European, as defined above, but if they adhere to non-Western, non-European creeds, then they cannot be part of our ingroup. There cannot be Western Buddhists, Muslims, or those who convert to the Jewish faith. We can consider as Western/European: Christianity, Euro-Paganism (Norse-Germanic, Greco-Roman, Slavic, etc.), Atheism-Agnosticism, as well as any Faustian-Nietzschean offshoots of these, including calls to build a new Western High Culture.

Behavior: A person who pursues policies harmful to our people's existence, who outmarry, who create racially admixed children with those from other groups, etc. - these cannot be part of our ingroup. Those who betray our people at the personal (e.g., outmarriage) or public (e.g., support for alien immigration) levels can never be part of our community.

Religion

Whites should be careful not to get divided over religion. I see the following as being compatible with Whites and the West: Christianity (in all its various creeds); Paganism; Deism; Creativity, Cosmotheism, and other secular race-based belief systems; and Atheism/Agnosticism. Religious (and other) belief systems associated with non-White, non-Western peoples and cultures (e.g., Judaism, Islam, Buddhism, etc.) are not compatible with Whites and the West. Within and between those belief systems that are compatible with Whites and the West there needs to be tolerance. Today, one of the main areas of intra-White religious conflict are Christians vs. non-Christians. From my perspective, these days the aggressors in this conflict are mostly the Christians, who constantly aver that everyone must be Christian to be a fighter for the West, and who often promote "Christian Nationalism" that elevates religion over race. That behavior needs to stop. If race-conscious White Christians believe that Christianity is compatible with pro-White activism, then they, the White Christians, are the ones that need to prove it; they cannot demand that non-Christians must help Christians build a proper Christian theology. And the Christians need to promote a philosophy that prioritizes race over religion, not the opposite, and, again, they must be the ones who do it. If White Christians cannot reform their religion, and do so on their own, then their failure would have proved the White racist critics of Christianity correct.

I believe that it is legitimate to form belief systems based on race – even religious or secular “religious” systems – to pursue group interests. But rational individuals should try not to fall into the trap of viewing innate group membership in purely (subjective) moral terms, as opposed to the more objectively justifiable recognition of group differences, group interests, and the necessity at times to oppose others and their group interests when they come into conflict with your own. One problem some people on the White racist Far Right have (and one that sometimes I recognize in myself and struggle against) is the temptation of seeing outgroup members in innately moral terms. In other words, these people are bad not because of what they do, or even for what they believe, but because of what they are. Thus, they are morally condemned for something they have had no control over – the demographic and civilizational group into which they were born. Now, this attitude may be adaptive, and it may well be payback for the way others condemn Whites as being innately bad, but, still, it does strike one as unjust and unnecessary. What one simply needs to recognize is that groups are innately different, have different interests, and Whites have the right to pursue their interests as do every other group. If outgroup members act in a manner to frustrate White interests, and/or hold and promote beliefs antithetical to White interests, then those outgroup members and their beliefs should be opposed. If the outgroup behaves in ways particularly dishonorable and destructive, if they put White survival into jeopardy, then indeed they should indeed be hated for that, and viewed as bad in moral terms.

Of course, ingroup members (broadly defined) who act in similar destructive manners should also be opposed and morally condemned (although in these cases, if they sincerely repent and do appropriate penance, there might be hope for these people). In summary, it is probably most appropriate not to *morally* condemn a person (or hominid, broadly defined) simply based on group membership, but on their actions and beliefs, when such is appropriate. However, it **MUST** be recognized that outgroup members are **DIFFERENT**, they are **NOT US**, they have **DIFFERENT INTERESTS**, and when interests clash, and our interests are threatened, we must **OPPOSE** these **OTHERS**. All that said, it may one day be necessary to codify innate group interests in (subjective) moral terms if that is necessary for White survival; however, I do not believe that we have reached that point yet.

High Culture

This book is not the place to discuss issues of High Culture, Spenglerian civilization cycles, and whether the culture of Whites going forward will be the Faustian Western Culture (or Orthodox culture for certain areas of Eastern Europe), now seemingly fully degenerated into “Winter,” or whether a new High Culture will emerge. Readers are encouraged to look at this post:

<https://westdest.blogspot.com/2011/03/overman-culture.html>

Regardless of the sociopolitical outcome for Whites moving forward, it is inevitable that traumatic times are ahead, which may sow the seeds for a new High Culture.

The Moral Outlook

While organization, societal structure, and ideology are all important, I agree with the Romanian Legionaries that personal character, the moral structure, the worth of the human material, are paramount. Thus, we must have The New Man, a moral overman, an ethical-spiritual rebirth, first among leadership and then extending down to as many of our people as possible - among the activist class most of all - to achieve our objectives.

For more on morals and ethics, see:

<https://eginotes.wordpress.com/2017/10/08/the-ethics-of-egi/>

<https://westdest.blogspot.com/2021/05/the-moral-state.html>

The New Man

See this post:

<https://westdest.blogspot.com/2019/09/the-new-man.html>

Corneliu, make out of our country a country as beautiful as the sun, powerful and obedient to God.
- Ion Mota

Readers of my work know that I have a long-standing interest in the Romanian Legionary Movement, its leader Codreanu, as well as prominent followers such as Ion Mota. I have long understood that the Legionaries hit upon a core fundamental idea that escapes today's activists – that there is something more important than ideologies, political programs, memes, and dogma. This fundamental idea is improving the human material upon which you will build your movement. Renewal of self, renewal of the moral capital of the individual, creation of The New Man, all of this is essential to ultimate victory.

Trying to establish a movement on a foundation of human detritus will quickly lead to complete collapse, as we see today.

Consider the following interesting article:

Valentin Sandulescu - „Fascism and its Quest for the 'New Man:' The Case of the Romanian Legionary Movement,” Studia Hebraica, No. 4, (2004), pp. 349 - 361.

Let's consider relevant excerpts from that article of relevance to The New Man:

...fascism developed an ideology and not just a reactionary movement, and identifies the goals of that ideology with the revolutionary will for a complete regeneration aimed at creating a new order and a “new man.” ... One may consider that the creation of what fascists termed the “new man” was the final goal of their cultural revolution... Therefore, the fascist project was based on a palingenetic myth, the idea of the nation's rebirth through the creation of a “new man.”... Codreanu envisaged a revolutionary platform for his movement, proposing a radical transformation of the country by reforming its human component... The idea of building a “new country” through a “new type of man” was not a conventional one and did not need exclusively conventional methods to be put into practice.... For him, the Legion's regenerative project, what he called a “spiritual revolution,” could not be fulfilled by ordinary man but by new, “spiritualised” human beings... Codreanu did not shy away from describing the “new man” as a modern hero, who had to show magnificent strengths in a plurality of fields...

See this:

<https://miscarea.net/mota-ashes.htm>

"It is not enough to reassert the ideals of the students; a student conference cannot be reduced to a mere show of ideology; a conference must be an occasion to study the interior capacity of students to achieve their ends. It is pointless to talk of ideals if, at the same time, one does look to the means by which these ideals will be achieved.

What is the capacity for sacrifice of the youth united at this conference? It is only by a fusion of the student's personal life with his ideal that the latter's achievement can be assured.

The essential thing is the spirit of sacrifice.

We all of us have the most formidable dynamite, the most advanced weapon of war, more powerful than tanks and machine guns: it is our own ashes! Every power in the world is destined to collapse, whilst it remains with the ashes of brave fighters, fallen for Justice and for God." - Ion Mota

Let us be brutally frank here. One reason (among others) that the Far Right makes little progress is the relatively poor quality of the human material in its ranks. Dissident Right "leadership" often talks of "eschewing defectives" – a process that they do not do; further, some of these "leaders" can justifiably be labelled defectives themselves. Now, someone may argue "but look at the Left, they are a bunch of highly defective BioLeninist freaks and yet they go from victory to victory." Yes, but the Left has the entire globalist System behind them, they are riding high on the waves of modern degeneracy, and so they can get away with being freakish defectives. Indeed, one could argue that they could have achieved even more had they not been defective; we can be thankful for that at least. We are on the Far Right, opposing the System, dissidents who not only want to stop the rising tide of degeneracy but also stimulate our own cleansing wave to wash away the rot, cannot afford to engage in battle with low quality human material.

The New Man should serve as a model for the direction we need to go. If the Right prizes quality over quantity, then let us first strive for quality and then expand in quantity based on a firm foundation of sound human material.

METHODOLOGIES

What specific approaches should be used to promote the interests of our people in a post-national future? We will begin by considering the strategies used by other Diaspora peoples and point out approaches that could be used by Whites in a post-national future. Next, there will be brief discussions on several more specific activities that a post-national people can use. Finally, how these approaches can be used today, to fight our current battles, as well as using the approaches for a situation of a mixed ethnostate-stateless scenario, will be considered.

The Diaspora Strategy

In a sense, Whites living as minorities in nations controlled by non-White majorities can be viewed as a stateless people, functionally equivalent to various Diaspora peoples that have made their mark in history and some of which are still with us today. A study of those peoples and the strategies they have employed to survive and sometimes prosper in often (to at least some degree) difficult circumstances can inform the approaches that we can use in various possible future scenarios for our people.

Therefore, we can consider Dr. Kevin MacDonald's survey of Diaspora Peoples, while also keeping in mind his description of the collectivist, cohesive, ethnocentric Jewish group evolutionary strategy discussed in his trilogy on that subject, a Jewish strategy that has served them reasonably well during their Diaspora. By "reasonably well" I mean that the Jews have survived as a distinct people with a distinct identity, although there are serious negatives in Jewish history that Europeans need to avoid. First and foremost, of these negatives is the significant genetic admixture that took place early in the Jewish Diaspora, although their later policy of (stricter) endogamy (obviously breaking down to some extent today) should be emulated and improved upon. Second, the frequent persecutions and expulsions of the Jews, to a large part due to their own behavior, is also something obviously that should be avoided, to the extent possible. Obviously clashes between groups that are alien to each

other and share the same territory are inevitable, but the Jewish genius for antagonizing host peoples is perhaps **not** the best trait to be emulated.

MacDonald's work on this topic:

<http://www.kevinmacdonald.net/diasporapeoples.pdf>

The Roma example is not too relevant for our case, apart from that group's collectivism and social separatism. The Amish, Hutterites, Puritans, and Overseas Chinese are more relevant, and of course so is the ethnocentric, collectivist, cooperative, integrated Jewish Diaspora model that has been the focus of much of MacDonald's work and that is mentioned above. Some lessons to be learned from these groups are as follows.

There absolutely must be a priority put on strict endogamy, with marriage and mating only within the ingroup; ***purity of blood is paramount***. Given the importance of maintaining European racial integrity, the amount of mixing that other Diaspora groups have accepted (typically at the beginning of their sojourns, following by stricter endogamy, as with the Jews) would be unacceptable. That would destroy the European ethnotype, which I have defined as:

<https://eginotes.wordpress.com/2016/05/31/the-ethnotype/>

An ethnotype is a range of possible genotypes that characterizes populations that have specific sets of genotypes. An ethnotype is not as specific as an individual genotype; the ethnotype range consists of many relatively similar genotypes and is relatively stable across evolutionary time - albeit with selection and genetic drift occurring to modify the ethnotype as those processes affect the genotypic range that make up the ethnotype; it is *relatively* stable. The point is that these changes are normal, expected, and gradual, and, even with such change, typically there are broad similarities in a group's ethnotype over historical time. Thus, Otzi the Iceman and contemporary Europeans can be said to belong to the same overall European ethnotype, demonstrating the broad similarity over significant time periods. Ethnotypes can be seen as the total set of possible genotypes produced by a genepool, the total set of possible allele combinations, and that will be different from that produced by another ethnotype's genepool.

Of course, the ethnic genetic interests of Europeans are directly related to maintenance of group genetic integrity (see section on ethnic genetic interests in the APPENDIX). The European ethnotype must be maintained within the parameters of normal fluctuation, and with the absence of admixture. The genetic ethnotype would be destroyed by significant admixture that would permanently alter the ethnotype in a manner qualitatively and quantitatively different from the normal processes of selection and genetic drift. And, of course, European phenotypes would be changed as well if admixture occurred. We can say there is an ethnotype of phenotypes as well as genotypes, with the former dependent on the latter. All of this would be wrecked by admixture.

Therefore, we need an "ideology of endogamy." The group must also avoid intermarriage with alien elites and not only with the alien masses – unless such intermarriage can influence the elites in our favor **AND** if the progeny of such mixes is **ALWAYS** absorbed in the alien population and not in our own, with **NO** exceptions. The default should be no intermarriage at all, but if any occurs, the progeny should always be identified as non-European and part of the outgroup. The baseline European type at the beginning of the Diaspora approach must be maintained and a "one drop rule" of any ***subsequent*** admixture after the beginning of the adoption of the strategy should be accepted.

Like the behavior of the Jews, cooperative networks need to be international; therefore, the Diaspora group should attempt to influence the political, social, cultural, and economic life of their host nations

for their benefit, not only on a national level but internationally as well, taking an interest in the well-being of the group wherever they are and marshalling Diaspora resources to assist those of the ingroup who need it most. Thus, ingroup members should be willing to invest in influencing other nations, not only their own, wherever the ingroup lives is a subject of interest and influence. There should be an emphasis on kin relations – we help our racial kin, not racial strangers, regardless of citizenship or superficial adoption of cultural artifacts. To summarize: Collectivism, cooperation and altruism restricted to the ingroup, which should be international, crossing borders.

Moral particularism should be embraced – is it good for the group? The group should consider itself a chosen people, everything possible must be done to separate its identity from that of others. However, we must be careful to balance the requirements of a collectivist Diaspora strategy with the natural inclinations and culture of Europeans; we must do what we must to survive – unmixed! – but not lose ourselves in the process in other ways (such as culture). We must remain both biologically and culturally distinct, as well as maintaining our inherent values. There must be a maintenance of boundaries, strict distinction between ingroup vs. outgroup, and cultural markers allowing for cultural separatism. Please note that all of this does not contradict what I wrote in the Religion section about the dangers of subjectively categorizing the outgroup as bad. Moral particularism can be aimed at love of the ingroup (positive moralism), rather than as an automatic hatred of the outgroup (negative moralism). Avoiding blind hatred and subjective moral labelling of outgroups as inherently bad does not in any way prevent the ingroup from invoking moral particularism to always favor its own interests.

It would be a good idea to mirror groups like Jews and Puritans with a high investment strategy, rather than the low investment strategy of the Roma. By high investment we mean a k-selected strategy, which is more consistent with the European character, of intense care for offspring, an emphasis on education and accomplishment, and in general focusing more on quality than quantity with respect to family. On the other hand, we should follow the Puritans in combining high investment and high birth rates. The point is to make sure that the higher birth rates are still accompanied by a high investment strategy; have as many children as possible while still maintaining high standards for their upbringing and for family success.

Social gatherings are important, emphasizing the social nature of the ingroup. There must be mechanisms to mediate intra-group conflict (here, I am including inter-ethnic conflict among the Pan-European ingroup). To have the cohesion and organic solidarity to successfully engage with outgroups, you must make sure that there are no significant divisions weakening your ingroup, divisions that can be leveraged and exploited by others. You should make your group useful to the host nation, although there is benefit in promoting division among outgroups, to weaken the opposition, but be sure that this is not obvious, and your group is not therefore seen as destructive troublemakers (see the Jews as a people who have failed to conceal their machinations).

There must be *“conscientiousness, loyalty to the ingroup, obedience, and conformity to group norms.”*

The group must have a *“user friendly belief system”* that is not too complex.

There must be mechanisms in place to punish free riders (those who benefit from the group but who do not contribute to the group) and traitors (e.g., social ostracism, expulsion from the group); without doing so will wreck the adaptive fitness of the group. Free riding is poison to any collectivist effort and must be opposed. Note that computer modeling has shown that free riding and other selfish approaches are outcompeted by ethnocentrism, so free riding is not only destructive to group cohesion, but also ultimately destructive to its practitioners (see Ethnocentrism in the APPENDIX).

While ostracism and other forms of social pricing can assist in this punishment, internal motivation of the person to avoid free riding can also be promoted, such as the Calvinists who taught their followers that bad behavior was a “sin.” It is also important to enforce a strict moral code on the wealthy (who have more resources to evade such moral codes than those of more modest means). Like the early Roman Republic, we must monopolize, to the extent possible, the distribution of social capital, to incentivize collectivist group behavior. Rewards of both social and material capital should be provided, the latter particularly where self-motivation proves insufficient.

The Overseas Chinese are another group of interest, combining collectivism combined with “high intelligence” manifesting *“cooperative ethnic networks and social support services.”* The Chinese were able to discard intra-ethnic divisions to form a *“self-conscious national minority.”* A more in-depth view of the Overseas Chinese community can focus on MacDonald’s analysis of the Chinese in Indonesia and Thailand and how those experiences compare to that of Diaspora Jewry. The Chinese situation in Indonesia has been more precarious than in Thailand, due to a combination of historical circumstances, Chinese attitudes, and host attitudes. As per the latter, the Indonesians seem to be more nationalistic and collectivist than the Thais; MacDonald characterizes the latter group as more individualistic. In addition, most Indonesians are Muslims, which may also contribute to more intolerance toward the non-Muslim Chinese. While both Indonesians and Thais seem resentful and suspicious of Chinese economic success, Indonesians seem more focused toward economic nationalism, although in both countries some (native elites, for example) may value the “economic usefulness” of the Chinese (similarity to the Jewish experience in the West comes to mind). The Chinese seem a bit more assimilated in Thailand, which may help their position as well. The Chinese role in 1960s-era communist agitation in Indonesia obviously did not endear them to the right-wing Muslim native businessmen of that country. So, we can see how the characteristics and attitudes of the majority can influence the degree of friction toward a Diaspora-type minority. In Indonesia, there are two sets of “Chinese” populations – the ethnically (more or less) pure Totok group and the admixed Peranakan group, and there is some tension between those two Chinese-origin groups. However, it could be that, as MacDonald speculates, the presence of the partially assimilated, admixed Peranakan group helps to soften anti-Chinese attitudes among native Indonesians. Here, we see similarities with “Court Jews” and selected intermarriage between Jews and native elites, with the aim of infiltrating and influencing the elites and ameliorating discrimination. In Thailand, the Chinese associations provide significant targeted help to the Chinese community, compromising a *“comprehensive social welfare system.”* Aiding the social cohesion and organic solidarity of the Chinese Thailand community is that there is little intra-Chinese class resentment. I speculate that the presence of *the “comprehensive social welfare system”* contributes to this – lower-class Chinese know that they will be taken care of, and they implicitly understand that the upper-class Chinese are helping to contribute to this social welfare system. These Chinese associations also foster ethnocentrism among the Chinese in Thailand, and this approach is one that should be copied by Diaspora-style peoples.

In the case of a future stateless White situation, such associations should be transnational, helping Whites wherever they may be. This assistance can take many forms – economic (group autarky, help with starting businesses, patronizing group business, ethnic banks, loans, etc.), legal, social, self-defense, etc. One significant difference between the Jewish and the Overseas Chinese cases is that while the former have always been politically active in host societies, the Chinese in Southeast Asia – with a few exceptions (e.g., fomenting communism in Indonesia) – tend to exhibit a *“lack of political consciousness”* and focus more on economic success. Unlike the Jews, the Chinese in these areas also do not so strongly emphasize education; however, in contrast, Chinese in the West do so (and are becoming more politically active). Not being as verbally oriented in IQ as Jews, Chinese are not as invested in controlling the media and influencing host culture as are Jews. On the one hand, this more aloof attitude of the Chinese, and their lack of verbal skill, puts them at a relative disadvantage

compared to the Jewish case, but may also help prevent the development of such a strong defensive reaction on the part of the native stock. Whatever discrimination the Overseas Chinese have faced, it does not compare with that of Jewish history. In other words, less minority provocation results in less majority response. All in all, however, I believe that the strong political consciousness of the Jews is, in most cases, a better strategy than the more passive Chinese political approach. Group survival is protected when the Diaspora group has influence over the politics of the nation in which they live.

Question – am I being inconsistent with what I wrote before? For example, with this post:

<https://westdest.blogspot.com/2013/01/salters-four-ethnic-option-categories.html>

Am I advocating a Diaspora strategy now when I previously wrote that such was not well suited for Europeans? Let's first consider the post in question:

Key to understanding intra-polity ethny relations.

From "On Genetic Interests," Table 7.1 shows the following "ethnic dispositions" in a polity:

- 1. Territorial ethnic strategy - Traditional nation states and ethnic states.*
- 2. Territorial non-ethnic strategy - Majority ethnies in multicultural states.*
- 3. Non-territorial ethnic strategy - Mobilized minorities in multicultural states, and traditionally endogamous diaspora peoples: Armenians, overseas Chinese, Gypsies, Jews, Parsis.*
- 4. Non-territorial, non-ethnic strategy - Immigrants who assimilate.*

Let us consider these. Number one is obviously the optimal choice from both the ultimate (genetic) and proximate (sociopolitical, etc.) viewpoints. That is where "Whites" (European-derived peoples) worldwide should be. Unfortunately, whites are actually virtually all in number two, which is the worst possible choice of the four from both ultimate and proximate considerations. Multiculturalism for majorities is all about the steady displacement and replacement of the majority by others and the empowerment of organized minorities at the expense of the passive, atomized majority.

Number three is an interesting case. From the standpoint of the majority, the long-term presence of type three groups in a polity is an ultimate and proximate disaster. Unassimilated - and in some cases, unassimilable - minority groups are present, strategizing against the majority, expanding demographically within the same territory, and practicing ethnic nepotism often with the full favor of the multicultural establishment, the same establishment which strongly inhibits any sort of similar behavior on the part of the majority, which must remain passive, atomized, and helpless.

In addition, if the minority in question is genetically distant from the majority, assimilation of the minority - even if desired and if possible - may be more of a blow to majoritarian genetic interests than the status quo. Thus, for genetically distant minority groups, separation is the best prescriptive option for the majority, while for genetically more similar groups, assimilation can be considered, if practical, while weighing the pluses and minuses. Note that some of the diaspora "middleman minorities" would be expected to resist assimilation even if the majority decided that such was the best course of action.

From the standpoint of the minority, strategy three has certain advantages, since it allows the group to continue as a genetically distinct, strategizing ethny, with the advantages of heightened minority mobilization and, in a multiculturalist regime, special advantages over the majority conferred by the establishment.

However, Salter critiques this option, even from the minority standpoint, as inherently unstable - even successful type three groups have suffered throughout their history as a result of not having their own territories. For groups long adjusted to such a "group evolutionary strategy," these negatives may be outweighed by the positives. However, for Western populations, type three is not a strategy we are adapted for, and would not be, long-term, likely successful at.

Further, type three groups have inherent differences in interests from all of the other three groups. A group cannot be, at the same time, in group three and in one of the other groups, AND there will always be an incompatibility of interests between group three and groups one, two, and four. Always. Those in group three will always be hostile to a society moving in the direction of strategy one, since strategy one will demand from group 3 assimilation, separation, or extreme marginalization. On the other hand, a type two society is optimal for the group three minority, but it hurts the majority. Again: incompatible.

Type four groups are those immigrants who assimilate. If these groups are relatively genetically similar to the majority, the long-term positives from a net EGI standpoint may outweigh the direct short-term gross EGI cost, for both majority and minority (however, if the groups are genetically distant - for example, inter, not intra, continental differences - then the costs are likely always to be too high, unless the numbers involved are very small). From the majority perspective, strategy four could work, therefore, given reasonable genetic similarity.

Salter notes that from the minority perspective, strategy four requires the group to give up the advantages of being a genetically distinct strategizing ethny. In addition, in a type two society, a type four strategy entails the assimilating group to become part of the majority that is being dispossessed and discriminated against. On the other hand, strategy three has its own problems, as stated above, and if a group is not suited for a type three group strategy and all that entails, then the option of assimilating to the majority is best. If the group wanted to remain distinct from the majority, then they could separate or have remained in their homelands. For Western populations as minorities in Western nations amongst a Western majority, type four is, generally, the best option. The trick is to attempt to move the society from the maladaptive type two to the adaptive type one. Thus, the interests of groups that are genuine "four" types coincide with that of the majority: move toward the type one strategy. Thus, group four is also at odds with the non-assimilating group three.

Although there is controversy about this among some areas of the web, I would say that "White ethnic" European Americans started out in group three (not necessarily by choice) but began moving into group four after the 1924 immigration restriction. Today, these "ethnics" are either totally in group two or are, at minimum, in the last stages of fully transitioning from group four into group two. They do, in the USA, suffer from the same problems as the rest of the majority, and are generally considered as belonging to such.

Thus, the interests of all Euro-Americans are in belonging to a type one polity.

That is the end of that post. How to "square" what I wrote there – that the interests of Europeans lie in having a territorial ethnic strategy – with the advice that we may need a Diaspora-style approach in the future? A simple answer, discussed below, is that we simply may not have a choice. Yes, the territorial ethnic strategy is optimal. But if fail to retain control over territory, what then? But let us consider this in more detail.

One criticism is that many, although not all (e.g., the Overseas Chinese in Southeast Asia) of the successful (or at least temporarily successful), Diaspora strategies took place, and are taking place, in

majority White societies that were and are more tolerant of minority groups compared to the world of Color. Therefore, Whites cannot expect the same level of tolerance if they are minorities in nations dominated by ethnocentric Coloreds. In addition, these non-White groups include those with historical grievances against Whites and the situation will be complicated by Whites becoming minorities in nations they once dominated, the dynamic of “the master dethroned.” Further, the dominant ideology of our age is anti-Whiteness. All of that is true. But, at least in the early stages of this scenario, Whites will make up a large fraction of the population and may even remain a plurality if there is no single dominant majority (although the other groups may unite around anti-Whiteness).

True, the non-territorial ethnic strategy is far less stable than having control of a defined territory. Also, Whites are by their nature likely not well suited for the non-territorial, post-national scenario. One can further argue that - if Whites are so weak, feckless, and individualistic that they cannot retain control over their nations, then how will they organize into cohesive, collectivist, Diaspora-style groups? And what about traitors and free riders?

All of those are legitimate criticisms. It would be better for Whites to retain, or win back, control of their nations, and remain majorities, or, even better, set up homogeneous ethnostates. The approach outlined here in this book can serve that purpose as well (as I explain elsewhere in this work) and can serve in the hybrid situation in which there are White ethnostates as well as large numbers of post-national, stateless Whites. But we must play the cards that we are dealt. If Whites fail to retain or win back their nations, if they find themselves in a post-national, essentially stateless situation, then they will have to make the best of it for as long as that situation obtains. They can attempt to win back territory, but they will have to deal with the facts on the ground as they exist, and even if a non-territorial strategy is unstable, and even if it is not well suited for them, if Whites have no choice, then they will need to deal with the situation the best that they can. Further, we can expect a ruthless weeding out process; those Whites who are insufficiently ethnocentric, who are too individualist and lacking in the collectivist mindset, those who are traitors and free riders, will be eliminated from the White ingroup population, either from violence from Coloreds, intra-group ostracism and expulsion, and/or assimilation into the outgroup Colored masses.

So, yes, the criticisms have legitimacy. It is better to win the ethnostate. But given current trends, planning for a “worst case scenario” is prudent, particularly if that planning utilizes approaches that can also be part of a winning strategy to win the ethnostate. You play the cards you are dealt, but by developing your skills as a player, you can come out as well as possible with whatever “hand” you have. A post-national future is a bad outcome. It should be avoided. Following the approaches outlined here, today, can help avoid that bad outcome. But if the bad outcome occurs, it needs to be dealt with, rationally and manfully. Even if there are many drawbacks and problems with a post-national future, if it occurs it must be dealt with, and whatever the flaws in the prescribed approach discussed here, there may be no better option. If better options exist, then they must be introduced and discussed.

Behavioral Control

See this book:

<https://www.amazon.com/Mortal-Republic-Rome-Fell-Tyranny/dp/0465093817>

In the book *Mortal Republic*, which deals with Ancient Rome’s transition from the Republic to “tyranny,” we read about the incentives that the (at its height) Republic gave to its (leading) citizens to behave in a manner consistent with the well-being of the polity and its populace (“The Senate and People of Rome”). We read:

The Republic effectively monopolized the rewards that leading Romans most craved...The measure of a man was then largely a product of his activities in the military and political lives of the Roman state. Service was repaid with honor...it paid these rewards out in a form of social currency that it alone controlled....A single dishonorable action could destroy all of the social capital that the family had spent generations building...this particular form of Roman currency...could only be earned through service to Rome.

Likewise, any organized pro-White endeavor needs to somehow acquire effective control of the rewards (“carrot”) that motivate pro-racial behavior as well as the punishments (“stick”) for anti-racial behavior. There are comments about the control of behavior in my discussion on Diaspora peoples and, further, the section on ethnocentrism in the APPENDIX also discusses free riding and other such problems. But we must have a carrot/stick behavioral incentive system in an even more general sense. We need to develop our own reward system and our own social pricing system, and that needs to be developed today. That is something that is going to be a key component of the approach discussed in this book, regardless of whichever historical scenario that approach is going to be utilized for.

It is of course difficult to actualize this behavioral control system even in the majority White nations that exist today. These nations are effectively ruled by an anti-White System that incentivizes bad behavior by rewarding White racial treason and using social pricing to punish pro-White activists. One could imagine that living as White minorities in a majority non-White state would result in even greater difficulties with respect to influencing our people in a positive manner, but these difficulties must be overcome. On the other hand, it is possible that White minority status could, out of necessity for survival, lead to greater intra-group social cohesion and more stringent control of behavior. But we would not have the state and society on our side, quite the opposite.

Also note that one reason why behavioral control declined in the Roman Republic was the influence of money; economic prosperity derived from conquest was concentrated into the elites, who became ever more rent-seeking in their behavior, putting self ahead of society. Therefore, we will need to somehow control the power of money and prevent a disruptive concentration of wealth in an elite. Further, we would need to prevent the established System from using the money power to corrupt our people, particularly our leadership. This is why The New Man, with a firm moral foundation, is so important.

It would be optimal if we had The New Man ready to go, throughout the length and breadth of the endeavor and thus sufficient self-motivation would exist to always do the right thing. However, given today’s reality, we will need to have the social currency in place to properly control the behavior of all who are not The New Man; these are most of our people, the currently available human material.

There are many problems that will need to be dealt with in controlling behavior and this book is not meant as a comprehensive analysis of the topic.

Hierarchy of Organization and the Legionary Approach

How should this overall approach be organized? There should be a hierarchical organizational structure, but, as well, not too over-centralized since that would strangle local initiative and put the whole endeavor in danger if enemies were able to seize control of certain key leadership positions.

But to the extent that there is some hierarchy, some leadership – and Whites *will* need leadership for both ideological as well as practical matters - I believe that this role can be performed by an elite, international, Pan-European, vanguardist “Legion.” We need a Legion like the Legion of Michael the Archangel, founded by Corneliu Codreanu in Romania. See this:

<https://archive.org/details/TheHistoryOfTheLegionaryMovement/History%20of%20the%20Legionary%20Movement%20-%20Horia%20Sima/>

However, this Legion would need to be Pan-European, and international in scope. Such a group can constitute the elite vanguard leadership of the overall approach outlined here, helping to lead and organize the various organizations dedicated to the genetic, cultural physical (safety), economic, social, political, legal, spiritual, etc. well-being of our people. As regards the sort of Legion I am referring to see this post:

<https://westdest.blogspot.com/2015/08/for-my-legionaries.html>

A relevant excerpt from that *Western Destiny* blog post, which was about Codreanu's book *For My Legionaries* is below.

Excerpt: *As is clear, Codreanu's movement and its emphasis on the New Man, squarely sits among the radicals, and it must be note that, while rejecting communism, the Legion also rejected predatory capitalism and plutocracy, and fought for social justice and a "fair shake" for Romanian workers. Such terms as "social justice" and "rights for workers" would no doubt cast a chill on the conservatives and their "sweet deals," and this helps to clarify some of the differences between the two groups.*

On pages 254-259 of this edition are two sub-chapters by Codreanu entitled Dangers That Threaten a Political Movement and The Critique of the Leader – these pages alone are worth the cost of the entire book. Somehow, by writing about Romanian nationalism of the post-WWI period, Codreanu also envisioned and predicted the pathetic failures – and some of the reasons for those failures - of the American "movement" of the period 1945-Present. It's all there – the inability to recognize and weed out infiltrators, agent provocateurs, incompetents, freaks, and defectives; the desperation for followers that means that anyone who meets the minimum criteria for membership and who professes any superficial allegiance is accepted into the very heart of the group, no questions asked; the inability to cut out/remove "gangrenous" elements before they infect the entire group; defects in character of leadership, leaders who are uninspiring, who do not know how to lead, who procrastinate and waste endless opportunities (how many Professor Cuzas have we had in the "movement"? – the list goes on. Read those pages and you'll recognize the American "movement" in all its tragicomic pitifulness. You'll also recognize a number of "movement" blogs/websites that have been destroyed because of their inexplicable inability to recognize outright (in some cases, virtually self-declared) frauds and trolls, sites whose "accept one and all" attitude have led to the sorts of rampant infections Codreanu warned about in this book.

Also, starting on page 289 are two sub-chapters entitled The Beginnings of Legionary Life and Our Program, which are also of great value and are must reading. Of particular interest is that the Legionary Movement, as opposed to the "movement," did not recruit. They simply established their way of living, performed their activities, and those attracted to that lifestyle, those drawn to the Legionary life, came to them. And, if of good character, they were accepted, and only if they performed up to standards and only if the Legionary life was acceptable to them, they were retained. And once accepted, once a part of the Legionary "nest," the Legionary found himself in a comradely collectivist environment of like-minded persons following this way of living, not a rigid "Führer principle" "movement" garbage dump of freakishness, procrastination, and incompetence. Note I use the phrase "way of living" to describe the Legionary "program" because that is precisely what it was: not an "official program" of detailed policies and memes, no "movement" stupidities with their invented sci-fi/fantasy "racial histories," calipers, "admixture ratios," dumb mantras, defective memes, ideological frameworks as flimsy as a house of cards. The Legionary "program" was to create a new type of Romanian, a New Man, to act, to become, to exert leadership within the national community - not to collect a bunch of bozos calling themselves

“Superhitler1488aryanbloodssmanlonewolfultranaziswastika88148814,” and/or folks with a documented history of mental illness, and/or obvious trolls with a documented history of blog-wrecking, or any other flotsam and jetsam of “movement” detritus, and then give these people “the keys to the kingdom” and then watch your blog flounder, your group files end up in the hands of “watchdog” groups, a quarter-century of “activism” yielding zero results, or any other typical “movement” outcome. Also, reading the Legion’s history, one notes for the record that many of their enemies and traitors ended up dead. Now, that last comment is NOT meant as any sort of advocacy for violence or any sort of thing, far from it – it is simply a statement of historical fact. Legionaries would sacrifice themselves – often on their own initiative – for the cause, and NOT by some moronic stupidity of shooting up a church or movie house, but by the specific targeting of their very public enemies. Again, that’s simply a statement of fact and not advocacy or promotion of anything. I also note that the more the “movement” talks about “eschewing defectives,” the more defectives of the types noted above are handed those keys and are welcomed with open arms. The “movement” is a joke; the Legionary Movement was of deadly seriousness.

I also note that the devoutly Christian Codreanu was forced to admit that most Romanian priests were openly hostile to the vehemently pro-Christian Legionary Movement. The great love that Traditionalists have for Christianity is an unrequited love, indeed.

Toward the end of the book Codreanu wrote a critique of democracy that ranks with Yockey’s own fine analysis of that subject. Codreanu dissects the unsuitability of democracy to solve national problems and provide national leadership. He asserts that an elite, which rises based on ability and personal qualities, is required. How exactly are the elite chosen? If a national elite already exists, it must choose its successor, and do so by confirming for leadership those who have proven themselves worthy. What if there is no pre-existing nationalist elite? How does the process begin? Codreanu writes...the real elite is born out of war with the degenerate elite. In other words, the founding elite of the national state is formed by those who have waged war against the degenerate elites of the anti-nationalists. Codreanu not only rejects democratically elected elites but, also (and interestingly from a movement that was so pro-monarchy) hereditary elites; indeed, Codreanu cogently observes that the replacement of an original elite of merit by elites of heredity (i.e., the original nobility earn their status through war and politics and then degenerates into a hereditary caste) is what caused the democratic revolutions to begin with. Analogous to my own statement that superiority must be earned and is not a birthright of any individual, group, or ethny, Codreanu proposes an elite of merit and ability, one that is rejuvenated by fresh blood each generation. Such analyses demonstrate that Codreanu the man of action was also a solid practical political theorist.

Codreanu also asserted that the movement must move on three levels: the individual, the national collective, and the nation throughout the ages, and each preceding level must accept the preeminence of the next highest level, with the nation over time (what we today would focus on as ethny or race) being of the highest level of importance.

Also see:

<https://westdest.blogspot.com/2021/07/holy-legionary-youth.html>

Should my old concept of “Legion Europa” be revived? That is something to consider.

Infiltration and Operational Security

A detailed discussion of operational security for the endeavors outlined here is beyond the scope of this work. In brief, what we need is a professional, competent, and effective strategy that outlines

practical steps with respect to operational security. The presence of infiltrators, informers, moles, and *agent provocateurs* in dissident movements is inevitable. It is necessary to limit their presence to the degree possible, particularly among the higher ranks, limit their access to important information and decision making, prevent their activity to derail group effectiveness, etc. It is important that, for the most part, the activities outlined in this work are such that, in the end, it doesn't matter if others know about it. These activities for the most part are public works based on supporting the well-being of a specific community. These activities are not guerilla warfare or anything of the sort.

Of course, with respect to infiltration, the opposite should hold, **OUR** people should be infiltrating **THEIR** System. But discussion of such strategies is, again, beyond the scope of this work.

Legal Issues

Similarly, detailed discussions about legal issues are beyond the scope of this work. No doubt governments, whether still majority White in the present time or majority non-White in a post-national future, will (and have at the present time) use lawfare against organizations and infrastructures that promote the interests of our people. A top priority for any activity, and we need this today, are organizations and infrastructures that defend our legal rights within whatever governmental system we find ourselves. The Dissident Right has heretofore struggled while being, for the most part, completely defenseless from a legal standpoint; that is mostly due to the incompetence, ineffectiveness, foolishness, and selfishness of Dissident Right "leadership." Obviously, this must change and the sooner the better.

Free Speech

The fight for free speech and freedom of expression is essential for our cause, and it is one that many in the Dissident Right, particularly in Europe, have foolishly disregarded (I have personal experience in dealing with such people). This is of sufficient importance that I have a Free Speech section in the APPENDIX devoted to arguments in favor of free speech, taken from my *EGI Notes* blog. I encourage you to use those arguments in your own activist work.

Economics

As regards economics, Whites need to be as self-sufficient as possible, and that applies to every possible racial scenario. In the case of ethnostates/Imperium, there should be as much independence from the world of Color as possible, a racial autarky. Economic self-sufficiency will obviously be more difficult for Whites to achieve as stateless minorities, but international, race-based economic "corporations" should be established to concentrate as much economic activity, and its benefits, to our people as possible. We should be building pro-White economies today. We need to help our people start businesses and employ White activists, we should give loans, help our people buy homes and start families, help them manage debt, provide advice for investing and taxes, and oversee a myriad of economic activities to promote their material well-being. To give one concrete example of Diaspora coordinated economic activity, the Overseas Chinese are good at setting up community banks for their community; several such banks exist in the United States. Further, Jewish networking takes many forms, including economic; we would be advised to emulate such ethnocentric networks. Of course, with all Diaspora strategies, it is understood that tolerant majority White nations are very welcoming environments for such minority mobilization, and Whites cannot expect the same free environment if they are in a minority status. But, still, we must do what we can.

Electoral Politics and Mainstreaming

We absolutely must be involved in electoral politics; I have written about this much in the past. Even if there is no chance of victory in any electoral race, political involvement legitimizes our positions, spreads propaganda, gets people organized (and these can then later be used for other activities), attracts recruits, etc. Any political victories, if they do occur, would not only boost morale and not only help spread our message, but would place our people in positions of authority within the System. We need people in positions of authority, including in elected office, to provide “cover” for our other activities, to leverage their positions to assist in any way possible, even if that assistance is only to obstruct and limit the persecution of our activities by the System. We need representation in the halls or power; this is another avenue of activity heretofore ignored by the Dissident Right in America, and we can see the consequences of that in decades of utter failure. Of course, we must husband our (limited) resources (but why must our resources always be limited? – ask your failed “leaders”), but the electoral politics leg of our approach must not be neglected. We just need to be strategic about it.

I have long been against “mainstreaming” – the softening and moderating of Dissident Right/Far Right positions to “enhance electability” and “attract more moderate voters.” First, remember that electoral politics are a means to an end; winning an election is not an end to itself. Second, mainstreaming repels and demoralizes hardcore activists and delegitimizes our agenda; by changing the agenda we tacitly admit something is wrong with it. Third, mainstreaming almost never succeeds. How many times has an election been won by this strategy? Not many. What happens most often is that the Far Right moves so close to the political center that the Center-Right can adopt and co-opt enough of the Far Right’s positions (by false promises of course) to poach Far Right voters. Meanwhile, many of those voters who are suspicious of the Far Right’s history won’t vote for them no matter how much they mainstream. Fourth, there is evidence that “farstreaming” – when a rightist candidate moves further and further to the right – is more successful as an electoral strategy. Orban’s popularity in Hungary has increased as he has moved to the right. Trump won in 2016 by adopting positions that won favor among the American “Alt Right.” True, Trump was a disappointment as President then, but that was due to his personal failings, not part of an inherent flaw in the farstreaming approach. Fifth, even in those rare instances that a mainstreaming candidate wins, the nature of that victory is such that they will do nothing useful when in power, the ends and means are confused (see point number one). At the time I write this, Meloni in Italy is a perfect example of this fifth point.

True leadership consists in bringing the voters over to your side, not surrendering and bringing your side to the voters. What do I suggest? We need a combination of radical policies, forcefully promoted, but with calm and rational speech. Essentially, this is the Teddy Roosevelt “speak softly but carry a big stick” approach (as opposed to Trump’s “speak loudly and carry a twig” tragicomedy approach).

Reconquest

It is beyond the scope of this work to discuss the possibility of a reconquest of our nations if we find ourselves in a post-national state, and how we would go about doing it if it were possible. All I will note here are two points that should be obvious:

1) Any reconquest would of course first require that we still exist as a distinct people, as a racial-cultural entity. The basic approach outlined here can assist in making sure that we will still exist in a post-national future.

2. The ethnocentric collectivist Pan-European mindset, combined with the established organizational infrastructure required to survive in a post-national state, will be no doubt of great assistance in building the foundation of any attempt at reconquest. There needs to be a base of moral-ethical as well as

material support for such an endeavor, and the strategies outlined here would be crucial for establishing such a base.

Integration to the Current Approach

One crucial and fundamental aspect of the approach outlined here is that it is not only relevant for the contingency of a post-national future in which racial nationalist objectives of ethnostates have failed. Instead, the approach outlined here should be instituted right now as part of a strategy to achieve the desired racial nationalist objectives and prevent the need for any contingency plan for a post-national future.

We need a collectivist ethnocentric Pan-European mindset among our people *today*; we need a Brotherhood of Europeans *today*; we need international activist organizations helping our people *today*, and we must have, right now, *today*, a Pan-European elite, a Legion, a moral order, overseeing and organizing for the interests of our people worldwide. Virtually every facet of the strategy for a post-national future can be adapted and adopted right now to serve as part of the fight to preserve national futures for our people. The power of the approach outlined here is its flexibility to be adapted to different scenarios and to be used to promote the interests of our people. That is why we need to get started today. It will work for us in virtually every conceivable scenario.

This is related to Frank Salter's idea of "democratic multiculturalism" in which majority groups leverage the multicultural apparatus for their own benefit, demanding a seat at the table to demand that majority White interests be considered. This would "monkey wrench" the whole multicultural system, which is built on the twin premises of minority group mobilization and majority group passivity. If the majority becomes mobilized, then the multicultural regime becomes inherently unstable; multiculturalism for everyone, including and especially majorities, will inevitably lead to multiculturalism for no one.

If the entire existential meaning of multiculturalism is empowering minorities to dispossess majorities (and indeed that *does* seem to be its meaning), then the empowerment of majorities within the system undermines the very foundation of multiculturalism. "Suvorov's Law of History" as I call it (adapted from the works of defector "Victor Suvorov") asserts that ***revolutions are not made during the time of greatest repression but when that repression is suddenly relaxed***. Using the approaches in this book, including applying them to democratic multiculturalism, can pressure the System into making concessions, relaxing repression, showing weakness, which can open the road to an eventual racial nationalist victory. As one example, the various cohesive social activist organizations that would serve White interests in a possible post-national future could be used, today, to demand multicultural rights for White majorities in what are still majority White nations. These organizations can begin the process of generating social capital – honor, status, reputation, leadership roles – to reward and incentivize pro-White behavior, and to promote the interests of the more ethnocentric among us. Most of all we need to help pro-White activists, protect them from social pricing from the System, and provide tangible rewards, of both social and material capital, for their efforts.

About "Victor Suvorov" see:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Viktor_Suvorov

Combination Model

The approach outlined here is not only relevant for the completely stateless pure Diaspora model and for the "take back our nations and form ethnostates model" but also a combination model in which one (or more) ethnostate is established while many, and perhaps most, of our people continue to live outside

of that state in the Diaspora. The classic model here is today's Jewry, which has an Israeli ethnostate combined with a powerful Diaspora, primarily located in majority White nations. Here, the ethnostate can provide a central power source and organizing center for the Diaspora activities, as well as serving as a refuge for ingroup members whose sojourn elsewhere has become too problematical. Of course, given the large numbers of Whites, any refuge area would need to be considerably larger than Israel, and still even then could not contain a sizable portion of Whites (unless, unrealistically, the entire USA or Europe became such a state, or there were multiple refuge states). A model in which there is a *large* ethnostate coupled to a Diaspora would be that of the Overseas Chinese, a situation in which persecution of the Chinese Diaspora in Southeast Asia was muted by fear of China's possible response. Today, in Europe, countries with a large Overseas Chinese community, like Italy, must tread carefully for the same reason (Anglosphere countries need little encouragement to grovel to their Asian minority groups). The main point is that the Diaspora approach, suitably modified, can work very well even when an ethnostate exists.

CONCLUSION

Summing Up

Our European Mission is to create the Culture-State-Nation-Imperium of the West, and thereby we shall perform such deeds, accomplish such works, and so transform our world that our distant posterity, when they behold the remains of our buildings and ramparts, will tell their grandchildren that on the soil of Europe once dwelt a tribe of gods. – Francis Parker Yockey, *The Enemy of Europe*

If this approach is necessary from the standpoint of a post-national future, then that quote from Yockey may be less relevant than otherwise; however, even in this case, our people could still achieve great things, and as long as we exist, recapturing a homeland is possible. In the cases of using the approach outlined here to win totally and achieve the ethnostate, or a situation of a mixed ethnostate-stateless combination, the Yockey quote is more relevant. But whatever the future holds, there will be great and difficult tasks for our people, and we must be up to the challenge.

Ironically, I suspect that the approach outlined in this essay may fail, or more likely, never be seriously attempted, for the same reasons it is necessary in the first place – the utter and complete international failure of the Dissident/Far Right, the lack of serious and competent activists of sound character, the lack of authentic Pan-Europeanism and the related dominance of various hostile divisive “isms” (e.g., Nordicism, ethnonationalism, petty nationalism, etc.), the lack of rightist organization and organizational skills, a failed Dissident Right leadership more concerned with ego and fundraising than with genuine political activism, and all of the other myriad faults and flaws that have wrecked the Right and made a post-national stateless future for Whites an ever-increasing possibility.

The failures and deficiencies of personnel, leadership, ideology, character, organization, and revolutionary seriousness that is dooming the success of Whites to retain control over their states is also preventing effective alternative approaches and contingency plans being actualized to deal with the consequences of that impending doom.

No doubt readers will have objections to some (maybe all?) of what I have written here. With respect to those critical readers who are pro-White, I encourage them to come up with their own ideas as to what should be done, and then there can be discussion and debate on these topics. I do not claim that all I have written here is correct or the last word on the subject, but it is a starting point for discussion. These issues needed to be put forth for analysis. Even those who may agree with what I have written may critique it for not providing sufficiently fine details about what should be done. I make no apologies

for providing a “big picture” view of the problem. Again, we must start somewhere. If there is general agreement on the “big picture” and if there is a critical mass of quality human material willing to actualize what is proposed, then we can work on the details. There is no point in discussing details if there is no discussion, debate, and consensus about the overall approach that we need to take. In addition, much of these details, to be effectively put into practice, will require specialized expertise that I do not have, so it would be inappropriate for me to pontificate on specific details on things of which my knowledge is superficial. This book is meant as a “big picture” exercise. Let us first deal with that.

I make no apologies for presenting here a work that is ultimately prescriptive rather than descriptive. Yes, it is descriptive with respect to, e.g., analyzing the behavior of Diaspora groups, but even that is for the purpose of prescribing certain behaviors. More importantly, I realize that this work may not be very descriptive with respect to getting people on the Dissident Right to follow its suggestions. Such things as genuine Pan-Europeanism, rational strategizing, serious political work, community engagement, etc. are anathema to much of the Dissident Right. I am not sanguine that the suggestions contained in this book will be accepted by many on the Far Right. When I suggest things like “The Fundamentals” I am not optimistic that this will be descriptive of what rightist activists will believe and how they will act. This work is fundamentally prescriptive. Whether or not it can be descriptive is up to its readers.

What Next?

There needs to be discussion and debate within the international Far Right/Dissident Right on the topics of this work. If there is agreement that the problem is real and needs to be addressed, then the next step is to decide what approaches will be accepted (at least initially) to deal with a possible post-national future, and which of these approaches can be implemented now, to both (1) prepare for a post-national future and (2) to be used to achieve nationalist objectives and so prevent the post-national future from ever occurring. These approaches can include some or all of those listed in this work, or maybe some other approaches entirely, or some combination of my suggestions as well as other ideas. I note that some of the community organizing activities of CasaPound Italia in Italy, helping native Italians, is somewhat consistent with some of the approaches outlined in this book. Nationalists in other European nations have also sometimes recognized the need for grassroots community organizing. These types of activities, suitably enlarged and organized throughout the White World, can form the basis of some of the ideas I have in mind. I hope that nationalists of European descent will understand the importance of this type of activism and begin the process to actualize it.

The discussions and activities on these topics should be of an international nature, so I would suggest that the use of online platforms for meetings on this topic would be most practical, at least to get started. Implementation of any approaches should be done with the advice and assistance of relevant experts, whenever possible. Legal advice and assistance will be essential to ensure that all activities conform to the laws of the nation states in which they occur. Keeping all activities legal is essential and undercuts some of the problems with infiltration; at some point, these approaches will need to be public (although the initial planning of course should be private) and so, ultimately, there would be no “dire secrets” to hide. In addition, political, economic, organizational, academic, and media, etc. expertise would all be helpful. This all needs to be done in the most serious and professional manner possible.

If any nationalists of European descent desire further input from me with respect to this endeavor, I can be contacted at my *Gab* account: <https://gab.com/theodoresallis> - that account and my blogs are also listed below.

Executive Statement: A post-national, essentially stateless, situation for Whites worldwide is an ever-more-likely possibility. We need to plan today for that possible future. We need an ethnocentric, endogamous, collectivist worldview based on Pan-European solidarity – a worldwide Brotherhood of Europeans. Organizations of an international nature must be created to promote the interests of persons of European descent, to assist with political, social, economic, demographic, genetic, cultural, medical, scientific-technical, and defensive matters. These infrastructures should monopolize a reward system of social capital to incentivize pro-White racial activity. Overseeing this should be a worldwide Pan-European, modern version of the Romanian Legionary movement, led by persons of high moral content, human material developing toward The New Man. These approaches can be used today in the fight to save our nations and prevent the post-national future from occurring.

Ted Sallis
Occupied United States of America
2024

More information on the author and his work:

Blogs:

<https://eginotes.wordpress.com/>

<https://westdest.blogspot.com/>

Gab account:

<https://gab.com/theodoresallis>

APPENDIX

Ethnic Genetic Interests

A background introduction to ethnic genetic interests can be found here, which is reproduced below. More importantly, see the foundational work that this is based upon: Population and Environment (Vol. 24, No. 2, November 2002, pages 111-140), entitled: “Estimating Ethnic Genetic Interests: Is it Adaptive to Resist Replacement Migration?” He then followed this crucially important article with an even more detailed study in the book, On Genetic Interests: Family, Ethnicity, and Humanity in an Age of Mass Migration, 2nd ed. (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers, 2007).

See post:

<https://eginotes.wordpress.com/2009/06/28/egi-english/>

Introduction

“Mainstream” discussions about immigration, race, and the implications of a multiracial society usually consider only secondary questions such as economics, crime, culture, etc. They ignore the ultimate interest of a people: genetic continuity. No rational person would support policies that would, on the one hand, “enrich” their family while, on the other hand, simultaneously replace their family with strangers. And yet we seem to completely ignore the large scale effects of public policies on our greater “extended family”—the racial and ethnic groups to which we belong.

Concerned individuals have awaited a comprehensive and honest study of these issues. The wait is over. Dr. Frank Salter has published just such an analysis in the journal *Population and Environment* (Vol. 24, No. 2, November 2002, pages 111-140), entitled: "Estimating Ethnic Genetic Interests: Is it Adaptive to Resist Replacement Migration?" He has then followed this crucially important article with an even more detailed study in the book, *On Genetic Interests: Family, Ethnicity, and Humanity in an Age of Mass Migration*, 2nd ed. (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers, 2007). The following summarizes Dr. Salter's work.

Basic Considerations

Essentially, life as we know it is ultimately about the propagation of distinctive genetic information from one generation to the next. Living organisms can be seen as the vehicles by which this propagation occurs. Family members share many of the same distinctive genetic information, so a person's fitness is increased by the survival and reproductive success of his or her family. This is true also for population groups, or "ethnies," a term which can refer to races, ethnic groups, and/or various subgroupings of these. Like families, members of an ethny have more distinctive genetic information in common with each other than they do with people of other populations. Although the genetic relationship of ethny members is more diluted than that of family members, ethnies are larger reservoirs of genetic interests for their members because of their size, which can number in the many millions. Therefore, it can be as adaptive, or more so, to support one's ethnic or racial group as it would be to support one's own family.

A defined territory is crucial for the survival of an ethny. In the long run, territory is crucial for survival, and human history is largely a record of groups expanding and contracting, conquering or being conquered, migrating or being displaced by migrants. The loss of territory, whether by military defeat or displacement by migrants, brings ethnic diminishment or destruction—precisely what is happening in the "multicultural" West today. An important part of Dr. Salter's work is a quantitative analysis of this negative genetic impact.

Carrying Capacity

Dr. Salter's analysis is based on two concepts: carrying capacity and genetic kinship. Carrying capacity is the maximum population that can live in a given territory. Although technology and increased economic efficiency can increase carrying capacity, there is a practical limit above which further population growth is not possible.

Many ecologists believe we are approaching, or have surpassed, the practical carrying capacity of the Earth. Even if these ecologists are wrong about the Earth as a whole, it is clear that carrying capacity has already been exceeded in those areas where over-population has badly damaged the environment or depleted natural resources.

Immigration undermines the interests of natives even if their territory has not reached its carrying capacity. For example, the carrying capacity of the United States is probably significantly greater than its current population. However, one day its carrying capacity will be reached, and if at that point part of the country is filled with the descendants of today's immigrants, natives will have no room into which they can expand. In other words, even if the carrying capacity of the United States is as high as 600 million or more, if that population figure is ever reached, some portion will be the descendants of alien immigrants. The presence of millions of non-whites will make the parts of the United States they occupy unavailable to whites. We may reach carrying capacity later rather than sooner, but since the earth is a "closed system," it will happen eventually. The same principles apply to any other nation, including the nations of Europe, many of which are more densely populated than the United States.

Kinship and Child Equivalents

It is important to note that Dr. Salter treats the arrival of immigrants, not as a simple addition to the population, but as a one-for-one displacement of natives. This is methodologically correct, because when a nation reaches its carrying capacity, it is the presence of immigrants and their descendants that makes it impossible for natives to increase their numbers. What may not appear to be one-for-one displacement today will, in retrospect, be seen to be precisely that. The other concept central to Dr. Salter's argument is genetic kinship. Even though all humans share much genetic information, kinship is a measure of the genetic similarities and differences above and beyond this general genetic sharing.

Dr. Salter expresses the loss of genetic interest in units he calls "child-equivalents." In other words, Dr. Salter is asking: for any given member of the native population, what is the number of lost children that would equal the loss of his or her genetic interests caused by the arrival of a certain number of alien peoples? Note that we are not talking about actual children, but genetic equivalents put into the form of the parent-child relationship.

Put differently, the arrival of immigrants from other ethnies will change the genetic character of a population, and make it more alien to every member of the native ethny. The amount of genetic change, from the point of view of any given member of the native group, can be calculated as the equivalent of the number of children not born to that person. This is putting a number on the replacement of members of one group by members of another. Some examples will make this clearer.

The data that Dr. Salter used for these calculations derives from genetic assays. Please note that these specific studies are somewhat dated, although the most basic findings have been replicated in more recent research. It is very important to note that these data almost certainly underestimate the extent of genetic interests and underestimate the genetic damage done by immigration and multiracialism. That is because not only are the original studies somewhat dated and not as detailed as later work, but the findings do not include differences inherent in higher order genetic structure, which also contribute to genetic interests.

Dr. Salter begins by considering the English as the native population, and examines the effects of the immigration of 10,000 Danes, an ethny that is genetically very close to the English. Replacing 10,000 Englishmen with 10,000 Danes changes the genetic characteristics of the population so much that the resulting "post-displacement" population differs from the undisturbed population by the equivalent of an Englishman (or woman) "not having had" 167 children! Again, we are not talking about actual children, but of the genetic equivalent.

Effects of Immigration and a Multiracial Society

Let us consider other examples. What if the immigrants were Bantus—a population very genetically distant from the English—rather than Danes? Here the genetic cost to any given Englishman of the arrival of 10,000 Bantus is the equivalent of 10,854 lost children! Clearly, the extent of the genetic transformation of a population depends on the genetic distance between the native and immigrant populations.

What if the levels of immigration were greater, and more in keeping with the massive displacement of Western peoples we observe today? If 12.5 million Englishmen were replaced by an equal number of Danes, the genetic loss to each individual Englishman would be the equivalent of 209,000 children not

born; if the immigrants were from India, the loss would be 2.6 million children; if the immigrants were Bantus, 13 million.

These figures are not “guesses”; they are objective, mathematical results based on genetic data. As stated above, these figures likely underestimate the real genetic damage.

It is also important to stress that this loss is not somehow reduced by being spread over the entire native population. The loss in terms of genetic equivalents reflects the change in population from the point of view of every member of the native populace. Dr. Salter writes: “For a native woman it is equivalent to the loss of her children and grandchildren, for a native man it is equivalent to the loss of his children and grandchildren, though on a much larger scale.”

To further illustrate these points Salter then determines the number of immigrants of group y necessary to reduce the genetic interests of a random member of native group x by one child equivalent. For Europeans, an average of only 1.1 African or 1.7 Northeast Asian immigrants is sufficient for the loss of one child equivalent. In other words, using conservative genetic data that likely underestimate these effects, the presence of about one African, or about two Northeast Asians, damages the genetic interests of a typical white (i.e., of European ancestry) person to a degree equivalent to that of losing a child. This is a powerful and personal argument against racially alien immigration and against a multiracial society.

While plunging birthrates may be damaging for European-derived peoples, their replacement by genetically alien immigrants is much worse. A falling birthrate reduces the population but does not transform it, and a future increase in birthrates can always make up for the loss. Once immigrants have established themselves in a territory their genes are a permanent addition.

From the standpoint of genetic interests, the idea that “immigration makes up for low native birthrates” is pathological. The assertion that immigrants must be imported for “economic” reasons, or for some other short-sighted rationale, is therefore exposed as incredibly destructive to the interests of the natives.

Any consideration of the costs vs. benefits of immigration—or of a multiracial society in general—must absolutely consider the costs incurred at the most basic, most personal, and most fundamental human level. After all, humans are living, breathing organisms—“economic growth” or other issues are important only insofar as they influence real, living humans and human interests. A people do not “benefit” from “X” if “X” results in that people’s displacement and their replacement by others to an extent equivalent to mass murder.

Genetically, mass alien immigration is genocide. Similarly, a multicultural, multiracial society that manages the demographic eclipse of its majority population is also practicing genocide. These are facts which cannot be responsibly evaded.

Biopolitics

This is not meant to inspire dislike or anger towards immigrants—or towards any other people. On the contrary, such emotions are self-defeating and counter-productive. After all, these peoples are only taking advantage of the opportunities given to them for a better life and to expand their numbers in other peoples’ lands.

No, the ultimate causes of Western decline are that the governments and “leaders” of the West are openly and actively betraying the interests of their own peoples, and that the peoples of the West themselves, all too comfortable and unconcerned with their own demise, are seemingly uninterested in defending their interests. Or is it that Westerners are grossly uninformed about where their real interests lie?

Thus, this essay has three basic purposes. First, to introduce the fundamentally important concept of genetic interests—which are ultimate interests—to Western peoples. Second, to explain, succinctly but precisely, what is at stake: the demographic decline of an entire people, with a consequent devastating personal loss for each and every member of that people. Third, to encourage Western peoples, so informed, to engage in legal, peaceful, non-violent, and rational sociopolitical activism to pursue their genetic interests. Which means: to ensure their own survival.

What is required is the practice of biopolitics –the fusion of biological, human concerns with political action and public policy initiatives. Westerners need to stop focusing exclusively on secondary issues such as economics and economic growth, “cultural assimilation,” employment opportunities, funding for pensions, and a myriad of other concerns which—while certainly important and certainly worthy of interest and consideration—pale in significance compared to the ultimate problem of demographic displacement.

Survival comes first. All else comes second. Genetic interests come first. Other interests come second. Biopolitics will reorder priorities in the recognition that the well-being of the Peoples of the West first requires that these peoples continue to exist. Biopolitics will ensure that they do.

This essay is adapted from an analysis of Dr. Salter’s work that was published in the February 2003 issue of the journal American Renaissance.

Yockeyian genetics

The post:

<http://westdest.blogspot.com/2022/01/yockeyian-genetics.html> ***The following is an edited form (thus, the main text not italicized) of that post.*** Let us consider how a Yockeyian Imperium could affect the genetics of the European peoples constituting such a geopolitical entity.

Let us consider this paper:

<https://journals.plos.org/plosgenetics/article/info%3Adoi%2F10.1371%2Fjournal.pgen.1003316>

Population stratification caused by nonrandom mating between groups of the same species is often due to geographical distances leading to physical separation followed by genetic drift of allele frequencies in each group. In humans, population structures are also often driven by geographical barriers or distances; however, humans might also be structured by abstract factors such as culture, a consequence of their reasoning and self-awareness. Religion in particular, is one of the unusual conceptual factors that can drive human population structures. This study explores the Levant, a region flanked by the Middle East and Europe, where individual and population relationships are still strongly influenced by religion. We show that religious affiliation had a strong impact on the genomes of the Levantines. In particular, conversion of the region’s populations to Islam appears to have introduced major rearrangements in populations’ relations through admixture with culturally similar but geographically remote populations, leading to genetic similarities between remarkably distant populations like Jordanians, Moroccans, and Yemenis. Conversely, other populations, like Christians and Druze, became genetically isolated in the new cultural environment. We reconstructed the genetic

structure of the Levantines and found that a pre-Islamic expansion Levant was more genetically similar to Europeans than to Middle Easterners.

The last part – *“a pre-Islamic expansion Levant was more genetically similar to Europeans than to Middle Easterners”* – has some relevance with respect to putative “Levantine immigrants and slaves” in Ancient Rome, who may have been much more “genetically similar to Europeans” than are Middle Easterners today. Note also that post-Islamic expansion Muslim influx into Southern Europe may have been mostly Berber types (and that, with a net effect of only a few percentage points of ancestry, at the greatest). But those are the details.

The main point is that cultural similarity can influence genetics to bring culturally similar people to become more genetically similar, and more genetically distant and distinct from culturally alien peoples, even if the cultural aliens are geographically close and not much genetically different to begin with. The same principle can extend to the realm of politics and High Culture-Politics as that of a Yockeyian Imperium. Thus, we can understand how cultural-civilizational-political boundaries can influence genetic boundaries between peoples.

Consider this.

<https://dienekes.blogspot.com/2012/08/1000-genomes-project-community-meeting.html>

...during the last 1,000 generations there are more coalescences between Beijing Chinese and Japanese rather than Beijing Chinese and southern Chinese; in more recent times, there are more coalescences between Chinese groups. This makes some sense, if we suppose that -as seems likely- Mongoloids spread north-to-south across China during prehistory; the Japanese are thus linked -in older times- with northern Chinese, both of which are mostly descended from the northern Mongoloids; in more recent times, especially after the emergence of a uniquely Chinese polity and culture, the Chinese tend to marry other Chinese, hence they share more recent common ancestors within the country itself.

The take home point of this:

The same can apply to Europe and any (relatively small) potential kinship overlap that may currently exist between Europeans and non-Europeans. Once a “Western Imperium” is established, and gene flow from outside is stopped, over time, genetic distance between those groups within the Imperium and those outside will increase. Thus, even if there is no increase in gene flow within the Imperium, the fact that a genetic division will be established with the “outer groups” will ensure that Europeans will, over time, form an ever more cohesive genetic grouping, more clearly separated from non-Europeans. Thus, proximate influences ultimate, and genetic boundaries can become increasingly well matched with political-cultural-civilizational boundaries once gene flow between civilizational groups is stopped. And there is more than enough genetic diversity within each civilizational bloc to satisfy biological requirements in the absence of any inter-continental and inter-civilizational gene flow.

Genetic drift, selection, and other such processes would take place, with the within vs. without distinction further pushing Europeans and non-Europeans farther apart. There would also be, to an extent, increasing cultural distinctiveness to mirror that of genes/biology. The last part about *“biological requirements”* refers to an adequate amount of genetic diversity to enhance fitness, avoid inbreeding depression, and to provide the genetic variation to deal with changes in the environment (broadly defined).

So, we see that a political-cultural entity, the Yockeyian Imperium, would affect the genetics of its constituent peoples in such a manner as to support the underlying foundation of the Imperium entity itself, the organic solidarity of the European peoples.

See this genetic data:

https://4.bp.blogspot.com/-uwDKeF7HnRM/WFJ68fzbfUI/AAAAAAAAABCA/btxoo-6thC8_EZMhWX6_sPGPQ8HiONaWACLcB/s525/sazzini2016-fig2a.jpg

Consider that principal components analysis (PCA). By tightly restricting any possible gene flow strictly to the European Imperium, one would expect, over time, the European and non-European areas to be more distinct and segregated than they are presently, with the European PCA likely becoming more concentrated within a space of the two major axes (PC1 and PC2). Certainly, any tendency of greater intra-European dispersion and European/non-European convergence – the latter of which is no doubt being facilitated by alien immigration into Europe – would be repressed, and the opposing trends promoted. Any possibility that a given European and non-European ethnicity would be genetically closer than two European ethnicities would also be eliminated over time by the processes inherent in restricting gene flow strictly within the European family of nations. Thus, any such kinship overlap, if such exists, between, say, Europeans and non-European Caucasians, would be eliminated, as discussed above.

Cypriots are found in between Southern Italians and Near Easterners, thus, between Southern Europeans and non-European Caucasians. If Greek Cypriots are included in the Imperium while Turkish Cypriots are excluded, then the former group will, over time, converge with Southern Europeans in PCA while the latter will drift in the direction of Turks – because of restricting any (low level, see below) gene flow to the proper categories.

Now, one could speculate that the EU, and freedom of movement within it, would promote an increasing convergence and concentration of European PCA, but then the introduction of alien elements, not always evenly distributed among EU members) would counter-act that to an extent (e.g., a large number of Turks in Germany would, in the event of admixture, move Germans away from other Europeans, who are infested with alien types other than Turks - with the alien invaders being less interested in moving away from their favorite host nations than are natives willing to move elsewhere). So, the current EU, which combines both freedom of movement within and porous borders without, is not optimal for the proposed “Yockeyian Genetics.”

Now, one can argue that from the strict perspective of so-called Yockeyian genetics, the optimal situation would be an internal European-only panmixia, with complete internal freedom of movement and significant inter-marriage, coupled to a complete lack of movement and admixture with non-Europeans. While true, that would have the negative effect of erasing established European ethnic identities, and creating a generalized European type, which is not the objective of Pan-Europeanism (regardless of what its opponents claim). Thus, the objective of Yockeyian genetics is not the optimal, and most rapid, creation of a generalized Pan-European genetic type (with a highly concentrated PCA). Indeed, the type of Imperium I have in mind would have less internal movement than the current EU, to safeguard the uniqueness of specific European types. Instead, I propose to completely shut off outside influences, while allowing for, over time, low level intra-European gene flow to result in an increased European/non-European separation, and a degree of concentration of the European PCA, while still preserving the overall PCA (genes correlated with geography) structure and the uniqueness of the European types. A slow and modest “tightening” of the PCA over time with respect to Europeans, coupled to increased distance to non-Europeans is the objective, with the concomitant, desired elimination of any possible European/non-European kinship overlap. Thus, in every case, genetic distances between any chosen European ethnicities would always be less than genetic distances between

any European and non-European ethnies (in most cases, this is true today, but there may be some breakdown of that between the farthest ends of the genetic spectrum).

Thus, this would **NOT** be any panmixia, but the normal low level gene flow that has always occurred in history between distinct peoples, but in this case, restricted in the manner described above. Of course, if some European ethny wants to follow its own evolutionary path, and be completely genetically isolated from all other groups, to promote divergence, that's fine; freedom of association would be respected (but the opposite, bringing in racial and cultural aliens from outside the European sphere, would not be tolerated). But, given the behavior of people within the EU today, I suspect the opposite would be more of an issue – people clamoring for free movement between Imperium nations, a movement that would need to be restricted (to some significant degree) to preserve ethnic distinctiveness. These are details that would need to be worked out.

The consequences with respect to Salterian EGI would be supportive of the Imperium idea. Eliminating potential kinship overlap with groups outside the Imperium, and concentrating (to a natural extent over time, again, not a panmixia that would harm the more local specific EGI of individual ethnies) the European genepool, the EGI cost/benefit ratio would ever increasingly move into the direction of maximizing benefits and minimizing costs of the Imperium idea. Genetic distance to groups outside the Imperium would increase, making it more and more beneficial to exclude such groups and minimizing costs that would have obtained if kinship overlapped across the Imperium boundaries existed. Genetic distances within the Imperium would in all cases be less than any case of cross-boundary genetic distance, again maximizing benefits and minimizing costs. Not only would net EGI benefit from the Imperium arrangement (in that any significant EGI costs would be more than compensated by counterbalancing benefits), but by eliminating much of the costs, gross EGI would be maximized as well. This would particularly be the case if the uniqueness of individual ethnies is maintained, so the best of both worlds occur – individual ethnic group EGI is preserved, while Pan-European EGI is maximized as well.

To summarize, in outline form:

1. A Pan-European state (Imperium) would be set up that would have the effect of an enhancement of net EGI, by advancing the interests of the group of peoples and thus the interest of each constituting group.
2. To safeguard the uniqueness of the constituent groups, movement and mixture between these groups would be restricted, preventing any panmixia and loss of biological and cultural ethnic distinctiveness. Of course, there would be some (limited) movement and gene flow, consistent with what has occurred throughout European history.
3. At the same time, movement and mixture from without the Imperium, from biologically and culturally alien non-European peoples, would be strictly forbidden and absolutely restricted.
4. Thus, what would obtain over historical, evolutionary time is a complete absence of gene flow from the outside, coupled with continuous, low level, internal gene flow. Genetic drift, selection, and other such processes would take place, with the within vs. without distinction further pushing Europeans and non-Europeans farther apart.
5. These processes would have the effect, over time, of increasing the genetic distance of groups within vs. without the Imperium (European vs. non-European), while genetic distances within the Imperium would be maintained and/or slowly decreased (to an extent) over time.

6. Kinship overlap within/without would be eliminated due to these processes (particularly the strict isolation from outside gene flow). Thus, in every possible case, any European ethnies chosen for comparison would be genetically closer (measured with genetic kinship/gene sharing, F_{st} , or whatever) than would be any European ethnicity compared to a non-European one. In PCA, European groups would be more separated from non-Europeans, and the European groups may be expected to slowly concentrate around a narrower core grouping along the major axes of genetic variation – Europeans less spread out among themselves, but more isolated from others.

7. These processes would take place naturally over long-time frames, with ethnic distinctiveness being maintained, preserving local EGI while enhancing group EGI, leading to not only an increase in net EGI but gross EGI as well, a more optimal profile of genetic interests with costs minimized.

Would this process take centuries and millennia? Yes. An enduring structure is required, with an elite caste whose mission is to monitor and guide the process of directing European genetics. One would expect sampling of genetic metrics over time to evaluate the process, make sure all is going as planned, and to adjust as necessary. Some formula needs to be designed to make sure the process is politically and evolutionarily stable over time, that it is not hijacked or discarded, and does not become subject to elite free riding. Considerations of “freedom” need to be put into context – the ultimate freedom is the freedom to exist and to pursue genetic interests. Further, as an elite project, this would not interfere with the day-to-day life of most people, except for restrictions on movement between nations (and more so, in/out of the Imperium). But how many people relocate to other nations? And if one’s nation is an orderly nationalist state, as would be under this scheme, why would they want to?

Note for current approach: What was written about Yockeyian Genetics applies if the approach described in this work is used to achieve victory, if we succeed in establishing ethnostates, and, particularly, the Imperium. Even the combination scenario is directly relevant, as at least one ethnostate would be involved. But what about the post-national scenario? Maintaining, never mind increasing, European genetic distinctiveness is going to be much more difficult to achieve with Europeans as a post-national, Diaspora-style minority in majority Colored nations. However, I have stated that strict endogamy must be an essential part of the post-national strategy; therefore, the seven steps outlined above could still occur, with the first three steps achieved by cultural separation rather than geographical separation. So, in the last analysis, if strict racial endogamy is achieved, the outcome can be the same. The coalescence of European genetics will be more difficult in the post-national scenario, but not impossible.

Ethnocentrism

Re:

Max Hartshorn, Artem Kaznatcheeva and Thomas Shultz (2013), McGill University Psychology, Canada; McGill University, Canada, *The Evolutionary Dominance of Ethnocentric Cooperation*, Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation 16 (3) 7, <https://www.jasss.org/16/3/7.html>, DOI: 10.18564/jasss.2176

This paper is free online here: <https://www.jasss.org/16/3/7.html>

I reproduce an edited version (thus, the main text not italicized) of a blog post I wrote about it, analyzing certain quoted excerpts; again, the whole thing is open access, freely available, so I suggest you read it yourself.

The blog post:

<https://eginotes.wordpress.com/2023/08/06/adaptive-ethnocentrism-redux/>

I have discussed this body of work before. It is worthwhile to take a closer look at it now. I strongly urge you to read the whole thing, the original paper, for yourself, and use my analysis as a guide to point out the most important biopolitical points and interpretations.

Excerpts of the paper (in italics), with my commentary:

Abstract

Recent agent-based computer simulations suggest that ethnocentrism, often thought to rely on complex social cognition and learning, may have arisen through biological evolution. From a random start, ethnocentric strategies dominate other possible strategies (selfish, traitorous, and humanitarian) based on cooperation or non-cooperation with in-group and out-group agents. Here we show that ethnocentrism eventually overcomes its closest competitor, humanitarianism, by exploiting humanitarian cooperation across group boundaries. Selfish and traitorous strategies are self-limiting because such agents do not cooperate with agents sharing the same genes. Traitorous strategies fare even worse than selfish ones because traitors are exploited by ethnocentrics across group boundaries in the same manner as humanitarians are, via unreciprocated cooperation. By tracking evolution across time, we find individual differences between evolving worlds in terms of early humanitarian competition with ethnocentrism, including early stages of humanitarian dominance. Our evidence indicates that such variation, in terms of differences between humanitarian and ethnocentric agents, is normally distributed and due to early, rather than later, stochastic differences in immigrant strategies.

The paper uses computational modeling to determine the adaptiveness of four evolutionary strategies: selfish, traitorous, ethnocentric, and humanitarian. These are defined in the paper as follows:

Selfish A strategy of defecting against all other agents.

Traitor A strategy of cooperating with agents of a different tag and defecting against agents of one's own tag.

Ethnocentric A strategy of cooperating with agents of one's own tag and defecting against agents with a different tag.

Humanitarian A strategy of cooperating with all other agents.

By “agents” they mean individuals and by “tags” they mean the groups with which the individuals are associated. We can consider “tags” to be “ethnies” in the human context.

Note that the “selfish” strategy is essentially free riding, which has been described by leftists and HBDers as an alleged major impediment to ethnocentric ethnic nepotism, although Kevin MacDonald and Frank Salter have effectively argued against that as have I. The “traitorous” approach, which I consider an alternative form of free riding, and which can be defined as cooperating with outgroups and betraying your own ingroup, is, in practice, confined only to European-derived peoples; no other groups do this (although isolated individuals of such groups may, but these examples are vanishingly rare). The traitorous approach can also be associated with HBD and Racial Proximity Theory (RPT). In general, the findings are that ethnocentrism not only can be selected for but that it is ultimately the preferred evolutionarily stable outcome, outcompeting its major rival of humanitarianism “as world population saturates.” Note that selfish and traitorous strategies fare poorly, in contrast to the lies told to us by the Leftist and HBD crowds, with the selfish typically doing better than the traitorous except for

when ethnocentric strategies are excluded. It is perhaps not surprising that traitorous approaches do so poorly, which reflects real world experience.

Ethnocentrism is the tendency to favor one's own group at the expense of other groups. It is implicated in a variety of important phenomena from voting patterns to ethnic discrimination and armed conflict. It is widely believed in social science that ethnocentrism involves extensive social learning and considerable social and cognitive abilities (Hewstone, Rubin, & Willis 2002; LeVine & Campbell 1972; Sherif 1966). However, there is also evidence that ethnocentrism is common throughout a diverse range of animal (Chase 1980) and even plant (Dudley & File 2007; Runyon, Mescher & De Moraes 2006) species. Such evidence suggests that ethnocentrism may be rooted in biological evolution, and that its essential cognitive component is quite simple: the ability to distinguish in- vs. out-group members and select different behaviors based on that distinction.

We already see the authors essentially eviscerating the Leftist/HBD arguments that ethnocentrism/ethnic nepotism/ethnic altruism could not have evolved, with lots of huffing and puffing by the Left and by HBD about free riders. Although (as Frank Salter and I have exhaustively argued) the evolution of ethnocentrism is **NOT** required for a conscious, rational pursuit of EGI, it is nevertheless useful to note that ethnocentrism can, and has, evolved, is more adaptive than competing strategies, and thus is an optional and important addition to the toolkit of those who want to promote EGI

Recent computer simulations with simple abstract agents demonstrate that ethnocentrism can indeed originate through evolutionary processes (Hammond & Axelrod 2006a, 2006b). The agents in these simulations can either defect against, or cooperate with, other in-group or out-group agents, generating four possible strategies: (a) a selfish strategy of constant defection, (b) a traitorous strategy of cooperation with out-group, but not in-group, agents, (c) an ethnocentric strategy of cooperation within one's own group but not with agents from different groups, and (d) a humanitarian strategy of indiscriminate cooperation. From a random starting point, ethnocentrism evolves to become the dominant strategy under some variation in parameter settings, eventually characterizing about 75% of the world population.

Indeed. In the real world, the other 25%, the unfit, would include European-derived people.

The average proportions of the four strategies during the last 100 of 2000 evolutionary cycles were .08 selfish, .02 traitorous, .75 ethnocentric, and .15 humanitarian (Hammond & Axelrod 2006b). Systematic doubling and halving of key parameters (e.g., lattice size, number of cycles, number of tags, cost of cooperation) did not alter this distribution much, suggesting that evolution of ethnocentrism is not a knife-edge phenomenon but is instead quite robust. In fact, (Kaznatcheev 2010a) showed that the model is also robust to changes in the qualitative nature of the game matrix from PD to other competitive games.

There you go. A quantitative analysis provides you with evidence of the dominance of the ethnocentric approach.

Alternatively, one might focus on the dynamics of direct competition between humanitarian and ethnocentric clusters. As suggested by both previous results (Hammond & Axelrod 2006b) and present results, the chief competitor for ethnocentrism is humanitarianism rather than selfishness. Ethnocentrics of one cluster exploit humanitarians of another cluster, benefiting from the latter's cooperation while donating nothing in return. There are thus two candidate hypotheses to explain eventual ethnocentric dominance: the mediation hypothesis that ethnocentrics out-compete free-riders

more effectively than humanitarians do, and the direct hypothesis that ethnocentrics exploit humanitarians across cluster frontiers. We test these two hypotheses in Studies 1 and 2.

The second hypothesis turns out to be true.

We are also interested in explaining the lack of success of selfish and traitorous strategies, as well as the differences between the two. As noted, Hammond and Axelrod (2006b) reported the mean proportions of selfish and traitorous strategies across the last 100 of 2000 evolutionary cycles as .08 and .02, respectively. Are free-riders defeated by fitter strategies or are they self-limiting? In a viscous environment, with tags that come to correlate with strategy, one might well focus on the likelihood of interacting with in-group v. out-group members, as well as interaction strategy. Lacking any out-group cooperators to exploit, a spatially-clustered strain of selfish free-riders would be self-limiting. Traitorous agents would have the added disadvantage of being exploited in between-cluster interactions with out-group defectors. Study 2 attempts to tease out these dynamics by examining simpler worlds restricted to only some strategies.

Again and again, selfish and traitorous free riders do **NOT** prosper. Ethnocentrism is evolutionarily stable and outcompetes free riding strategies. Those who have been telling you that free riding is some sort of existential threat to ethnic nepotism are wrong. In fact, I believe they have been intentionally misleading you. Certainly, if they continue to peddle these falsehoods considering these findings, then you can be almost certainly assured that mendacity is involved.

In this study, we examine the possible temporal coincidence between population saturation and the establishment of ethnocentric dominance. Both the mediation and direct hypotheses predict a close temporal coincidence between population saturation and ethnocentric dominance. Both hypotheses also predict that the frequency of humanitarian agents decreases with ethnocentric growth, though the direct hypothesis predicts a direct relation not using the mediating influence of free-riders.

Our methodology is the same as in the original simulation (Hammond & Axelrod 2006b), except that we record strategy frequencies at every evolutionary cycle in 50 worlds and stop at 1000 cycles because solutions are always stable by then. We record results at every evolutionary cycle to provide a more complete picture of evolutionary processes and insights into the determinants of stable evolutionary outcomes.

To examine the unique predictions of each hypothesis, we perform a mediation analysis to determine whether the relation between ethnocentric and humanitarian strategies is mediated by suppression of selfish strategies. The direct hypothesis would be uniquely supported by finding an unmediated negative relation between ethnocentrism and humanitarianism, while the mediation hypothesis would be uniquely supported by finding evidence of such mediation through selfish free-riders.

These results indicate that the decline of humanitarians is due to direct exploitation by ethnocentrics and is not mediated by humanitarian deficiencies in out-competing selfish agents. As the world fills up and clusters of agents collide, ethnocentrism starts to dominate its closest competitor humanitarianism by virtue of ethnocentrics directly exploiting humanitarians across cluster boundaries. Strategies start to separate in frequency, whether ethnocentrics over humanitarians or selfish over traitors, when clusters collide as world population saturates.

Ethnocentrism wins. As population saturates territorial carrying capacity, and as mass migration brings groups into conflicts, ethnocentric populations prosper, humanitarian populations decline, and the selfish and traitorous groups crash and burn.

Most interesting for the mediation and direct hypotheses, however, is the extent to which humanitarians thrive in the absence of ethnocentrism. In simulations without ethnocentrism, humanitarianism dominates in a manner similar to ethnocentrism. This is evident in both three- and two-strategy simulations. Figure 4 shows mean strategy frequencies for three-strategy simulations that disallow either humanitarian (EST) or ethnocentric (HST) strategies, across 10 worlds averaged over the last 100 of 1000 cycles. Humanitarians perform similarly to ethnocentrics here, greatly outperforming both traitorous and selfish agents. A much smaller effect is that ethnocentrics out-compete traitors a bit more than humanitarians do, although this does not diminish the numbers of humanitarians relative to ethnocentrics, or the strong superiority of either humanitarians or ethnocentrics over traitors and selfish agents.

The fact that they can be outcompeted by milksof humanitarians tells you how bad the selfish and traitorous approaches really are. The idea that those failed strategies pose a real threat to ethnic nepotism is proved to be ludicrous.

There is the one anomaly in which traitors out-performed selfish agents in the HST simulation. Figure 6 shows that this is part of a more general trend in which traitorous agents fare significantly better whenever ethnocentrics are absent.

Well, yes, if they are not being exploited by the ethnocentrics that they would grovel to, traitors do better. If they betray their group interests to humanitarians, less harm is done, while betrayal to specifically benefit the selfish individual typically limits the damage to individuals, not entire groups.

The results of these restricted-strategy simulations contradict the predictions of the mediation hypothesis. In contrast to the notion that humanitarians cannot out-compete free-riders, humanitarians do very well against both selfish and traitorous agents. Selfish and traitorous agents limit growth of their own genotypes by not cooperating with them; although Laird (2011) noted circumstances where across-tag cooperation can sustain traitorous agents. Consistent with the direct hypothesis, the chief problem for humanitarians is ethnocentrism.

Thus, White humanitarian impulses were able to thrive until a growing world population, and mass alien immigration, brought ethnocentric non-White populations into the territories of humanitarian White ones.

The relatively poorer performance of traitors in the presence of ethnocentric agents can be explained by agent interaction across cluster boundaries. When traitorous agents of one cluster collide with ethnocentric agents of another, the ethnocentric agents earn outcome b , exploiting cooperating traitors by defecting against them. Just as ethnocentrism is poisonous to humanitarians, it is also poisonous to traitors, who incur a cost of c in such interactions.

Imagine here that the traitors are HBDers and the ethnocentrics are Asians. See how that works?

We find here that individual differences between evolving worlds are characterized mainly by early competition between the two fittest strategies: ethnocentrism and humanitarianism. Ethnocentrism always pulls away from humanitarianism by around cycle 300 as world population reaches its asymptote, while selfish and traitorous strategies never gain much of a foothold.

One can get away with humanitarian approaches in more sparsely populated scenarios, in which populations are more separated, and there is less existential struggle for resources. In the context of

a more heavily populated world, with groups in proximity and constant competition, as we have today, humanitarianism is a losing strategy.

Regardless of these early immigration bias effects, in all four of these simulation sets, ethnocentrism dominates by roughly 300 cycles and maintains this dominance to the end, as in our other studies.

** General Discussion*

The mediation analysis in Study 1 and the restricted strategy simulations in Study 2 support the direct hypothesis for ethnocentric dominance over humanitarianism. Across ethno-humanitarian cluster borders, humanitarians cooperate while ethnocentrics do not. This provides a reproductive advantage for border-dwelling ethnocentrics, who receive the benefit of humanitarian cooperation while donating nothing across cluster lines. In terms of the payoffs in Table 1, for such interactions, ethnocentrics increase their RPs by b , while humanitarians decrease their RPs by c . Ethnocentric agents are thus more likely to succeed in competition for empty locations along these borders.

This is what we see in the West today, as ethnocentric non-Whites outcompete more humanitarian Whites for niche spaces as world population saturates and population mobility increases.

The fact that traitorous and selfish genotypes perform just as badly against humanitarians as they do against ethnocentrics, and the lack of any mediation effect of free riding contradict the alternative mediation hypothesis that only ethnocentrics out-compete selfish free-riders. Although ethnocentrics can exploit selfish agents in neighboring clusters, the self-limiting properties of defection against the free-riders' own gene pool tend to diminish this advantage. Under many conditions, there are not enough free-riders to allow this potential ethnocentric advantage to be widely used. Notice that the dominance of ethnocentrism over humanitarianism, and the marginalization of selfish and traitorous strategies, can be explained purely via individual selection, without recourse to group-selection mechanisms.

But of course, group-selection mechanisms can still occur. The bottom line is still that selfish and traitorous strategies are ultimately failures, evolutionary dead ends, AND that ethnocentrism outcompetes humanitarianism (although the latter is still better than the other two alternatives).

Unlike selfish free-riders, traitorous agents have the additional problem of being exploited by the very out-groups they cooperate with. This explains why traitorous genotypes typically do even worse than selfish genotypes, despite the traitors' greater capacity for cooperation.

This is an **EXTREMELY** important point. This is consistent with one of my past arguments against the free riding problem. There, I put the selfish and traitorous approaches, along with free riding outgroup ethnocentrics, under a general free riding umbrella and asked why the critics of EGI and ethnic nepotism always concentrate on the damage done by free riding between members of the same ethny, but ignore cases where outgroups are involved. Free riding that involves outgroups will be more damaging than selfish free riding solely within the ingroup. In any case, ethnocentrism outcompetes all.

Our simulations suggest that very early stochastic bias in favor of either humanitarian or ethnocentric immigrants affects early competition between these two main strategies. Before worlds fill up, most interactions are with an agent's own strain. Because the in-group strategy components of humanitarianism and ethnocentrism are identical, there is little in these early cycles to favor one over the other.

“Own strain” is problematic here. Compared to what? What degree of genetic differentiation is the boundary between own/other? This perhaps may depend on the population density and the types of populations available for comparison. The problem of RPT is instructive here. The environment in which RPT developed, Northwest European populations for the most part encountering and competing only with other Europeans, no longer exists. What may have been adaptively ethnocentric then is now a traitorous strategy of cooperating with genetically distant ethnocentric aliens at the expense of more closely related European peoples. And as this study shows, traitorous strategies do poorly, particularly in the presence of ethnocentric competition. Is this one reason why Northwest Europe (and the Anglosphere) is faring the worst with respect to multiracial replacement and multicultural madness?

Unlike previous simulations (Hammond & Axelrod 2006a, 2006b) that focus on stable evolutionary outcomes, we examine the entire course of evolution. This provides a more complete picture of evolutionary processes, as well as insights into the determinants of stable evolutionary outcomes. Despite eventual ethnocentric dominance under viscous environments and group tags, we found surprisingly strong early competition from humanitarians. In contrast, strategies that fail to cooperate with their own kind (selfish and traitorous) never gained much of a foothold. Examination of the full evolutionary course also helped to test hypotheses about the eventual ethnocentric dominance. To thrive early in evolution, it is useful for population clusters to support their own kind. Later, as the world fills up, it is useful to exploit the cooperation of neighboring clusters.

Here, “own kind” can mean humans in general.

As mentioned earlier, a relatively high benefit/cost ratio is a natural consequence of social specialization in abundant environments. For example, a healthful tip from your doctor or a free tuneup from a mechanic friend cost little to give, but can yield considerable benefit to the recipient. Interestingly, task specialization is not limited to humans, but can be found in a variety of social animal species, and not just the eusocial insects (Anderson & Franks 2001; Gazda, Connor, Edgar & Cox 2005).

Much of what Frank Salter suggested in *On Genetic Interests* was of a high benefit vs. cost ratio behavior, in contrast to the mendacious who harp on a single sentence about extreme self-sacrifice under theoretical conditions.

Importantly, our decision to study a one-shot PD framework, where agents have no memory of previous interactions, significantly reduces the cognitive assumptions placed on our agents. A number of simulations have demonstrated how cooperation may emerge in an iterated Prisoner's Dilemma framework, where agents remember the outcomes of previous interactions (Axelrod 1997; Fogel 1993; Sandholm & Crites 1996). We opted for Hammond and Axelrod's (2006) memoryless model because we are interested in ethnocentrism in its most elemental form.

The memory-emphasized form of such interactions may allow for some types of cooperation and alliances between ethnocentric populations against a common foe (is this how various non-White groups strategize and ally against Whites?). Also keep in mind that the definition of what is the ethny in question, the ethnocentric group, can vary upon context and the level of analysis. Ethnic group? Race? What?

The idea of cooperation based on memory can serve to allow for closely related groups, each practicing ethnocentrism, to come together as one unified ethnocentric group, opposed to more genetically distant constellations of ethnocentrics. This would include different European ethnic groups coming together to form an ethnocentric Pan-European entity. But the cooperation must be genuine; betrayal and selfish/traitorous behavior will be remembered by us all.

A last point is that we can see how both the Leftists and HBDers have been **LYING** to you on this subject. That the Left does should not surprise you and their motives should be obvious, but what about HBD? You see, ethnocentrism and the pursuit of EGI by Whites threatens the status of Jews and Asians in the West; thus, HBD as a political movement, aimed at privileging Jewish and Asian interests and forming a EurAsian community along with Nordics (who would be second class Outer Party members in this scenario), must delegitimize the ideas of ethnocentrism and EGI via unmitigated mendacity. Among Whites, HBD is an example of a traitorous strategy that fails. Don't get sucked into that loser's game.

Also see this:

<https://eginotes.wordpress.com/2023/09/10/more-on-ethnocentrism/>

Kaufmann

See these posts on Kaufmann and his work:

<https://eginotes.wordpress.com/2019/10/05/mudshift-eric-kaufmann-and-the-question-of-genocide/>

<https://eginotes.wordpress.com/2019/12/16/mudshift-part-ii/>

Free Speech

A free speech primer:

<https://eginotes.wordpress.com/2015/01/27/a-free-speech-primer/>

Long time readers know that I am very interested in issues of free speech, and strongly oppose "speech laws" such as exist in Europe, and particularly abhor the hypocrisy of the high priests of democracy pontificating about "freedom" as they restrict the most basic freedoms to support regimes of totalitarian multiculturalism and multiracialism. I recently read where Jews are pushing for yet MORE speech restriction in Europe, which is remarkable, since free speech there is already outlawed and I'm not quite sure what more can be done, unless they want to make it illegal for a European to refuse to grovel in the dirt when a Jew walks by. Regardless, I want to summarize some arguments against speech restriction; I see this as important, and I hope that champions of free expression, particularly in Europe, read this and utilize whatever arguments here that they find useful.

General statement of principle: You cannot criminalize dissident opinions and call that tolerance; you cannot restrict the right to expression and call that freedom. It's very easy to make clichéd statements such as "there can be no tolerance for intolerance," but who is it who decides what "intolerance" is? Those in power can very easily eliminate their opposition by labeling opposing viewpoints as "intolerance" and "hate;" thus, legitimate expressions of sociopolitical opinion and of genuine interest become outlawed. That is not democratic, it is not tolerant, and it is not freedom, it is a blueprint for totalitarianism. In a fully functioning democracy, you cannot draw a line around topics that constitute some of the most crucial issues that face a nation (e.g., the future demographic and cultural makeup of that nation) and declare that certain viewpoints on these fundamental issues are beyond the pale. You cannot expect members of the national community to accept the legitimacy of decisions about these issues when those members have been excluded from the discussion. Any decisions made without open debate and consideration of the full spectrum of viewpoints are completely illegitimate from the standpoint of any honestly democratic state. And this goes beyond politics; one cannot have open and honest scholarship when it is actually illegal to question details about particular historical

events. *This is madness, it is a turn to the dark ages; it is a total and complete disgrace, it is the modern equivalent of burning witches and heretics at the stake.*

Some specific issues:

The “fire” argument. An over-used argument is that restriction on speech has always existed, and the analogy of “you can’t yell fire in a crowded movie theater” is usually invoked. I agree that is morally objectionable to maliciously yell “fire” when you know that such a fire does not exist. However, it is even more morally objectionable to NOT yell fire when there is evidence that a fire really exists, when you see the flames and smell the smoke. Most objectionable of all would be laws that prevent people from warning others about the existence of fires, laws that prefer to see the innocent burn rather than have them properly warned. Given that there are legitimate reasons (whether you agree or not) for people to view immigration, multiracialism, diversity, etc. as dire threats to the native population, equivalent to a “fire,” it is therefore morally objectionable to prevent these people from bringing these threats to the attention of their fellow citizens.

The “fighting words” argument. We are told that “fighting words,” speech that could incite violence, have always been prohibited; thus, the analogy is made to whatever opinions those in power want to suppress. Besides the danger of having those in power having the authority to outlaw speech that threatens their own power and authority, there are three basic problems with the “fighting words” argument. First, who decides? What should be the definition of “fighting words?” After all, what one person believes is a mild and rational statement could be viewed by someone else as outrageous and justification for violence. In Europe today, adherents of a particular non-European religion have been killing cartoonists because they view satire against their beliefs as “fighting words.” Yet, most Europeans, including those on the Left, find nothing objectionable about the satire. Who’s right? Who’s wrong? Why? Truth be told, virtually any statement could be found objectionable and offensive by someone; therefore the “fighting words” argument potentially holds any opinion, any comment, any belief hostage to the objections of anyone in the community. Second, we have hypocrisy. It is mysterious indeed that the System seems to only find Rightist memes to be “fighting words, and never those of the Left. Indeed, when the Left heaps the most vile abuse on the West and its traditions, that is simply “protected free expression,” but when the Right defends those traditions, then those are “fighting words.” Thus, the problem of hypocrisy and that of definition go hand-in-hand. Third, there is the problem of self-contradiction. Indeed, there are many who would label the very idea of speech restriction itself as “fighting words.” Therefore, support for speech restriction should itself be....restricted?

Then we have the mindless chants of “racism is not an opinion, it is a crime.” Very well. Can we extend that theme to other memes? Anti-religiousness is not an opinion, it is a crime. Support for abortion is not an opinion, it is a crime. Criticism of Europe and the West is not an opinion, it is a crime. Marxism is not an opinion, it is a crime. Mass immigration is not a policy, it is a crime. Homosexuality is not a lifestyle, it is a crime. Oh dear, it seems like we do have a problem now, don’t we?

Getting back to “racism” – racism is at its most basic simply freedom of association writ large. It is a perfectly normal human reaction to racial differences. Criminalizing racism is criminalizing human nature. It is the equivalent of the government telling you who you should have as friends, who you should marry, this is the most overt totalitarianism, it is outright madness for any state claiming to represent “democracy.” This is thought control at its most Orwellian.

Legitimacy: getting back to a theme noted in the general statement of principle: decisions made in the name of the people have legitimacy only so far as that the people – ALL of them – are allowed to

express their opinions on the subject, freely debate it, and be allowed to protest what they object to about that subject. If the multiculturalists want “bigots” to accept the verdict of elections that impose multiracialism, then those “bigots” must be allowed to freely contest that election, speak their minds, and have their opinion included in the mix. Individuals disenfranchised from the process will not accept the legitimacy of the outcome of the process. Given the growing support for the “far-Right” in Europe, the numbers of people so disenfranchised will become an increasingly large fraction of the population, making democracy untenable. You end up with ludicrous scenarios such as a political party in Greece being the third largest political force, while its leadership languishes in jail for expressing the same opinions that are winning them votes. We have the bizarre scenario throughout Europe of popular political parties being banned, and the mainstream right and left joining forces to exclude from power nationalists who are supported by a sizable fraction of the nation’s population.

And this goes beyond politics. Why is the Left so afraid of having their ideas debated? Why are they afraid of a free marketplace of ideas? If they are confident they are right, and the Right is wrong, why are they so intent on making sure the Right is muzzled and far-Right ideas never see the light of day? The basic ideas and memes of a society, as well as the products of academic scholarship, have merit and legitimacy only to the extent that they are freely discussed, debated, refuted or defended, and proofed for logical rigor and consistency with known facts. Speech restrictions dispense with the Western idea of free thought and bring us to the dark ages of rigid dogma. Intellectuals today sneer at the “close-mindedness of the past” – Socrates and the hemlock, the martyrdom of Bruno, the persecution of Galileo, and the Salem witch trials, but they behave exactly the same. They are unable to see that they have become in the present that which they mock from the past.

See this essay on the topic:

<https://eginotes.wordpress.com/2018/10/01/yelling-fire-in-that-theater/>

Proponents of hate speech laws often like to make the analogy of comparing so-called “hate speech” to “yelling fire in a crowded movie theater.” Putting aside the obvious riposte as to who it is who is going to determine what “hate speech” is or is not, how these determinations will not be biased, and how these determinations would not simply be used to silence dissidents by labelling any unwelcome expressions as “hate,” let us look at this more fundamentally, and make the assumption that by “hate speech” the censors refer to pro-White, racial nationalist, ethnic nationalist, race realist, immigration restriction, EGI, racial preservationist, etc. memes and expressions.

Two points:

First, the analogy is false because yelling “fire” (when there isn’t one, we presume) in a crowded movie theater is an act of memetic vandalism without any legitimate social or political content. What could be such legitimate content? That someone opposes the idea of movies? That they oppose the particular movie being shown? There are other ways of expressing such views without committing a malicious act specifically designed to cause harm without any underlying intent of sociopolitical messaging. On the other hand, dissident expressions about the System’s anti-White racial policies have great social and political content. In fact, the entirety of such expression is social and political content. Protesting alien immigration, determining the future demographic nature of nations – this is the very essence, the fundamental core, of social and political content; as evolved beings, as humans, what could be more important than who does, and does not, populate our nations?

It is therefore unreasonable to equate reasoned discussion of controversial issues on race and immigration (or anything else of significant social and political content) with content-free verbal vandalism such as “yelling fire.” Note that there is also a difference between incitement to violence and

reasonable dissident speech. The former is already illegal, as it is solicitation to commit battery, homicide, etc., while the latter is clearly of a different nature. Remember that all the SJW HR directors like to tell us that “offensive behaviors in the workplace” are those that “any reasonable person” would find offensive. The same applies here. Reasonable people would (or should) agree that pointing at “X” and yelling “Kill him! Kill X!” is incitement to violence; while asserting that the presence of X in our society is harmful, and pointing out why this is so, is not. One riposte to that could of course be: who defines a “reasonable person?” Very well, if you want to go down that “rabbit hole,” then please start with your local SJW HR director. Ask them. Further, if we live in a “democracy,” assuming that all adult citizens are reasonable enough to vote, then we hope that they are reasonable and can understand the argument distinguishing political commentary from incitement to violence. Another sophistic riposte is to assert that the mere act of explaining why “X” is harmful would lead to violence against “X” and thus is “incitement.” Let’s consider the implications of that reasoning. Thus, SJWs who criticize “racists” are guilty of incitement to violence (actually, in this case they DO in fact openly incite violence, but let’s make believe they merely criticize). Those who warn against “global warming” are inciting violence against gas station owners and coal miners. Those who rail against the obesity epidemic are inciting violence against the overweight and against workers at fast food restaurants. Those who complain about the opioid epidemic are inciting violence against doctors and pharmaceutical companies. No. Mere criticism about harm cannot be construed as incitement of violence against those who may be directly or indirectly responsible for that harm. We have a right to identify harm done to us and to identify who is doing it. We have the right to identify threats so we can defend ourselves, which can be done in a variety of ways, including non-violent ways, and thus it is not “incitement to violence.”

Second, let’s flip the analogy. Let’s assume that there really IS a fire in the movie theater. You notice it starting, but you just quietly leave without telling anyone and everyone else in the movie theater dies. Not yelling fire when there really is one is just as bad – worse – than yelling fire when such does not exist. If the problems of race and immigration pose real dangers, then we have an obligation to speak out about these issues. Yes, speak out responsibly, but speak out. To restrain such speech is to prevent people from being warned about threats to themselves, their people, and their nation. That is immoral and violates the most basic human right of self-defense (including group self-defense) and self-protection.

Another essay on this topic:

<https://eginotes.wordpress.com/2022/12/03/yelling-fire-redux/>

I’ve said it before, and I’ll say it again here. The “yelling fire in a movie theater” paradigm for justifying restrictions on free speech fails for two reasons. First, yelling “fire” when no such fire exists is nothing more or less than malicious verbal vandalism; that speech has no real political content, no social commentary, no underlying contextual meaning. On the other hand, commenting on race and culture, expressing opinions on the demographic future of your nation, opposing immigration and integration, and/or commenting on any number of controversial issues is in fact all about political content and social commentary, is full of deep meaning for society, and constitutes opinions that can shape the opinions of others and that absolutely must be read and heard. That is the entire meaning of free speech, and you cannot have free speech while restricting legitimate political and social commentary; such commentary is not meaningless verbal vandalism.

Second, what happens if there really is a fire in the movie theater? Why do we always assume the yelling of “fire” is malicious? If there really is a fire, shouldn’t we want people to yell and yell loudly? If people perceive controversial political and social issues as “fires” threatening their society, then they must have the right to yell and warn others; indeed, they have a social duty to do so, and any who would prevent them from doing so potentially puts that society in danger.

Also see:

<https://eginotes.wordpress.com/2019/06/09/white-nationalism-free-speech-and-legitimacy/>

An excerpt from that post:

And we must remember that the concerns of White nationalists are real; in fact, not only are they real, but they are the most important concerns of all, dealing as they do with the ultimate interests of national existence and genetic continuity. Whites are in demographic and cultural eclipse, and will become minorities even in their historic European homelands. The United Nations openly advocates “replacement migration” targeting White nations (while Whites are told, at the same time, that any mention of that is “conspiracy theories”). Whites are the only people on Earth not allowed to organize on the basis of racial self-interest; indeed, in majority White nations this expression of racial self-interest is either already criminalized or subject to social pricing (that is not good enough, it seems for the American Left, as they are now pushing for criminalization). How is this repression consistent with legitimacy? Obvious, it is not. The System simply has no effective argument against the basic premises of White nationalism; therefore, it must use coercion. However, as argued above, political coercion in the context of “democracy” is illegitimate and will erode the basis for peoples’ willingness to invest in the collective good.

Finally, I have to note that one major reason why White nationalism has reached such a sorry state of powerlessness and repression is the utter failure of its leadership. The inept affirmative action leadership coupled to defective followers have squandered endless opportunities, and smeared White nationalism with the stench of failure – made more laughable by the endless cries of some of them that we are “moving to victory,”

And some of the leadership have no sensible understanding of the animating mindset of the censors. For example, it is hard for me to express in words how absolutely foolish Richard Spencer is being here.

How naive can you be to actually believe the System will ever definitively and carefully – much less permanently – clearly state speech codes that can then be worked around. Let me tell you the obvious – the only speech they want from WNs is silence. No matter how you try and get around their speech codes, they’ll just keep on changing them to justify censoring you. They will forbid more and more words, and once that becomes untenable, they’ll just forbid “tones” and “implications” – all decided upon arbitrarily to achieve their political goals. It’ll be the race of the Red Queen and you can never win – it’s the gatekeepers of access who will have the power to determine what is acceptable or not. Once there are speech codes that are accepted as a part of society, nothing stops those codes from being constantly fine-tuned to silence opposition.

The only speech code that you can “work around” is NO speech code. You need either a platform that cannot be or will not be censored and/or an extension of “protected class” to include sociopolitical beliefs – with the former being more realistic than the latter. The idea that the System is going to finalize a set of speech codes that would enable anything other than mild civic nationalism (if even that) is absurd. Of course, Spencer may claim he is only talking in theory, but advocating for speech codes in theory (however unrealistic) is not anything anyone on our side should be doing.

The future looks grim and I have no easy answers. But I do know that asking for a more snug fit for our memetic straightjacket is not the answer. This is not an athletic contest between gentlemen, with both sides playing by the rules. The System will continue trying to change the rules in the middle of the

game in order to win. The only weakness they have is that the game has spectators, the White masses, and while these are mostly inert, they are not all completely inert. The System's ability to "cheat" is constrained by their need to appear to be playing fair, to trick the rubes into believing the "free democratic America" still exists. Thus gives our side some room to maneuver. Begging for better defined constraints is not the direction our maneuver should be going.

Final note: The main text of *After the Deluge* was written in the Fall of 2023, with final editing in 2024. Since the writing of the main text, there has been the Taylor vs. Johnson debate on the future of White America, with Taylor promoting disengagement here:

<https://www.amren.com/videos/2024/06/can-the-usa-again-be-our-home-part-ii/>

There is some overlap between the *After the Deluge* strategy and the disengagement approach. The strategies and tactics discussed in this book will likely become more relevant to Whites worldwide, and, possibly, at least in part, increasingly discussed by the Far Right/Dissident Right, even though they may not cite this work as part of their banning/blacklisting campaign, and they may develop some of the ideas independently.

The march of events will force consideration of some of the ideas discussed in this book.